

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07097050 4





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY 1895.

ART. I.—SCIENCE IN FETTERS.

PART II.

IN the former part of our article,* we called special attention to one set of those sensuous impediments which render difficult a truly scientific grasp of various important truths, because our nature (at once corporeal and intellectual) only enables us to estimate and allow for the influence of phantasmata of the imagination and does not permit us for one moment to dispense with the use of them.

After reminding our readers of the fundamental difference between sensuous and intellectual perceptions and the necessary supremacy of the intellect, we proceeded to select, as our preliminary illustration of such impediments due to the imagination, difficulties which thence arise in the science of biology. We referred especially to conceptions of the Soul of Man and of those active immaterial principles of individuation which our intellect reveals to us as the probable source of those wonderful vital processes that take place in ourselves and in the world of animals and plants amongst which we live.

It is a similar kind of impediment which makes it so difficult to most of our modern men of science to accept the idea of creation (whether of different kinds of living creatures or of the whole material universe), or indeed a belief in any real Divine Action upon nature. This difficulty, however, will

* See the DUBLIN REVIEW of January, 1895, p. 158.

be most conveniently considered in treating of theological rather than biological truths.

Towards the conclusion of the former part of this paper we spoke of the tendency of naturalists to propose hypotheses asserting the existence of very small particles (gemmules, biophors, plastidules, idiosomes and what not) in a vain endeavour to relieve themselves, by the help of the imagination, of the necessity of accepting truths incapable of being mentally visualised.

This tendency is but one far more general and which is common amongst men of science who know nothing of biology, but are only physicists (as well amongst men who are both), to regard the universe as ultimately consisting of minute solid particles in motion.

Thus Haeckel, in his *Monism*,* tells us—

Modern physics and chemistry have indeed in the main accepted the atomic hypothesis first enunciated by Democritus, in so far as they regard all bodies as built up of atoms, and reduce all changes to movements of these minutest discrete particles The idea steadily gains ground that no such thing as empty space exists,† and that everywhere the primitive atoms of ponderable matter or heavy “mass” are separated from each other by the homogeneous ether which extends throughout all space. This extremely light and attenuated (if not imponderable) ether causes, by its vibrations, all the phenomena of light and heat, electricity and magnetism. We can *imagine* it‡ either as a continuous substance occupying the space between the mass-atoms or as composed of separate particles; in the latter case you might perhaps attribute to these ether-atoms an inherent power of repulsion in contrast to the immanent attracting power of the heavy mass-atoms, and the whole mechanism of cosmic life would then be reducible to the attraction of the latter and the repulsion of the former.

Haeckel is admirable as serving so exceptionally well to warn us against the extravagances of any ordinary physicists, since he may be said to be a sort of Spartan Helot, intoxicated with the power of his idealistic-materialism. Thus he ventures even to describe these atoms as if he had actually seen and handled them.

* “Monism as Connecting Religion and Science; the Confession of Faith of a Man of Science” (translated by J. Gilchrist, M.A., &c.). London: Adam and Charles Black. 1894. Pp. 18-21.

† Thus he admits (as we long ago pointed out), that modern science reinforces the scholastic dictum that “nature abhors a vacuum.”

‡ The italics are ours here and elsewhere.

He tells us : *

To these original or mass-atoms—the ultimate discrete particles of inert “ponderable” matter—we can with more or less probability ascribe a number of eternal and inalienable fundamental attributes; they are probably everywhere in space, of like magnitude and constitution. Although possessing a very definite finite magnitude, they are, by virtue of their very nature, indivisible. Their shape *we may take to be spherical* [!]; they are inert (in the physical sense), unchangeable, inelastic and impenetrable by the ether. Apart from the attribute of inertia, the most important characteristic of these ultimate atoms is their chemical affinity—their tendency to apply themselves to one another and combine in small groups in an orderly fashion. These fixed groups (fixed, that is to say, under the present physical conditions of existence of the earth) of primitive atoms are the atoms of the elements—the well-known “indivisible” atoms of chemistry, the qualitative, and, so far as our present empirical knowledge goes, unchangeable distinctions of our chemical elements are therefore *solely* conditioned by the varying *number* and *disposition* of the similar primitive atoms of which they are composed.

He also tells us,† as to the most remote past, of

An unbroken series of natural events, following an orderly course of evolution according to fixed laws from a *primeval chaos* to the present “order of the cosmos.” At the *outset* [!] there is nothing in *infinite* space but mobile elastic ether, and innumerable similar separate particles, the primitive atoms‡—scattered throughout it in the form of dust; perhaps these are themselves originally “points of condensation” of the vibrating “substance,” the remainder of which constitutes the ether. The atoms of our elements arise from the grouping together in definite numbers of the primitive atoms or atoms of mass.

The position taken up by Professor Haeckel is after all but an extreme manifestation of the wide-spread tendency which exists to explain all the most obscure phenomena by the aid of imagination of solid bodies in motion.

This tendency, inasmuch as it is so widespread, must have a cause as universal and widespread as is the existence of the tendency. Men do feel a certain satisfaction and mental rest in so interpreting such phenomena—phenomena of all orders, from those of heat and chemistry to those of sensitive nerve tracks and even of thought itself.

* P. 26.

† P. 32.

‡ The doubly hypothetical atoms which he supposes to compose the hypothetical atoms of the elements.

What then is the reason of this satisfaction and mental rest which sufficiently accounts for the tendency referred to—the tendency to explain all things by solid bodies in motion?

As we reminded our readers in the first part of this article, “we can imagine nothing except what our senses have previously experienced, either as a whole or in its constituent parts.” But this intimate connection between experience and association occasions results which may be summed up in the following law: “Facts of experience are reproduced in our imagination with the greater ease and readiness, the more frequently or continuously they have been experienced by us.”

But there is no phenomenon which is more frequently and continuously the subject of experience to us than motion, and especially the relative change of place of solid bodies. We have that experience in every movement of our own frame, either in its change of place as a whole or in the movements of its several parts. Every breeze which sways the branches, or but makes the leaves of a tree to vibrate, reveals it to us. The dust blown by the wind, every cloud that sails across the sky, gives us such experience. By it our dawning infantine intelligence is first aroused* to activity; as it notices the

* We had just written the above word when our attention was called to an alleged recent discovery at Leipzig, by Professor Flechsig, of four similar connected centres of concentration (complexes) in the human brain (in the surface of the cerebrum), which are said not to be developed in the child till some months after birth. They are described as formed by connection with the various nervous centres of the several organs of sense, which are so brought into relation with each other, and by innumerable fibres, with the four centres which are very reasonably called by Professor Flechsig “centres of association.” They are represented as non-existent in the lower animals and the human infant, it not being in the latter till the third month that the four centres begin actually to form, more and more nerve fibres shooting forth from the centres of sense into the four regions (referred to), ending close to one another in the cerebral cortex. They have been absurdly spoken of as the organs for converting “sensation into ideas.” In the first place we are strongly persuaded that no cerebral organs will be found to exist in man, rudiments of which (at the least) are not to be found in the higher animals—certainly in the apes. But, however this may be, no one who knows anything of Catholic philosophy will be the least disturbed by any discovery of the sort here referred to. The existence of such “centres of association,” or organs of the “*sensus communis*,” was already inferred by the scholastics as a necessary condition for our lower sensuous activity. Such “centres of association” probably also seem to afford that sensuous basis (phantasmata of the imagination) which, as already pointed out, are necessary—as material conditions—for the presence in us of any, and also of our very highest abstract thoughts. They do not in the very least tend to weaken the distinction between sensation and intellection—between the sensuous and the intellectual forms of our psychical activity. Such discoveries have as little bearing on that distinction as have

movements and gestures of those around it, and the movements it can itself impart to objects it begins to grasp or to repel with its hands or feet. When growing into boyhood the throwing of stones or balls, the spinning of tee-to-tums and tops, and later, school games of all kinds up to football and cricket, continually reinforce the lessons taught at the dawn of mental life. The motion of solid bodies is the most primitive, most constant, and most universal of all our experiences. What wonder then that a sense of ease and pleasurable relief should be felt whenever difficult and puzzling phenomena of any kind can be represented by the imagination in terms of the motion of solid bodies? The sense of relief and ease thus experienced may well seem to incautious and superficial thinkers to really be an "explanation" of such problems.

Objects of considerable size can mostly be broken, cut, or crushed by us with smaller portions, but very minute fragments and particles of sand or dust are too small for us to be able to subdivide without the artificial aid of magnifying glasses. Hence arises a vague feeling of distinctness in nature between larger bodies and those which are the minutest we can see, especially as the properties of the latter are obscure or entirely hidden from us, save that they are solid particles. Thus the notion arises of large bodies possessing many obvious qualities, being composed of (because they can often be actually divided into) minute particles, which themselves possess very few qualities indeed.

Through a combination of these multitudinous and continual experiences, the tendency has arisen, extending from a remote antiquity (probably long before Democritus) to the present day, to endeavour to represent all the phenomena of the world by mental images of particles in motion (Karl Pearson's "Dance of Atoms"), and to regard such representations as so many "explanations."

We do not, of course, mean for one moment to underrate

discoveries about the connection between injuries and cerebral functions upon the question of the soul's survival after death. All the latter discoveries tell us no more than does the fact that "when the brains are out man will die, and there an [apparent] end." So, since thought needs organs of sensuous association, the necessary existence of which was ages ago proved, we should give a hearty welcome to any modern scientific confirmation of the ancient scientific prediction.

the enormous practical value and utility, as working hypotheses, of atomic chemistry, undulatory theories of light, electricity, or ether; our sole intention is to point out the entire unsatisfactoriness of regarding such hypotheses as actual objective truths and real explanations of the most recondite problems of nature.

Many persons variously and worthily distinguished as admirable workers and adepts in physical science, present to us the singular spectacle of men unconsciously mistaking their own limited powers of imagination for real tests of the external, objective conditions of the universe.

Had they been acquainted with what may be called the most elementary principles of the scholastic philosophers, they would, through an apprehension both of the limitations imposed on the human imagination and of the wide grasp of objectivity possessed by the human intellect, have been preserved from errors which only befit the intellectual childhood of mankind—errors pardonable enough in a Democritus but inexcusable in those who have had the opportunity of acquainting themselves with the work of man's reason at its best, before it had begun to be degraded and stultified by the teachings of Descartes and Bacon.

But not only are our powers of "imagination" (though not of "thought") limited by our past experience, but an unvarying experience may actually distort the mental perceptions of those who are not on their guard against its effects. For a still further consequence of the intimate relation borne by imagination to experience, is, that "Coexistences of experience which have invariably, under all circumstances, and in all their parts and conditions, been experienced by us as coexisting, cannot be imagined (cannot be 'mentally visualised as separate.')" A similar law also prevails as to the sequences of phenomena: "Whatever facts have been invariably, under all circumstances, and in all their parts and conditions, been experienced by us in succession, cannot be imagined by us as simultaneous or with their experienced succession reversed."

We who are unmaimed have, of course, always experienced the co-existence of two feet and two hands, yet we can imagine ourselves deprived of all our four extremities. But this is no contradiction to the above generalisation about "experience;"

for we have all experienced our limbs in various different conditions, and we have plenty of experience of the severance of parts, and (even of the limbs) of other bodies. Such experience, then, we can readily apply to imagined conditions of our own members.

Similarly, we have very frequently seen the sun set in the evening, and, less frequently, seen it rise in the morning. Nevertheless, we can imagine the sun rising again in the evening after it has set, or setting again in the morning after it has risen. But this facility is due to the fact that the *elements* (the parts) of such imagined evening sunrise and morning sunset *have* been experienced by us, and can therefore easily be rearranged by our imaginative faculty in the abnormal way supposed.

But no man, anywhere or anywhen, has ever met with an object which has not got some other object beyond it; and no man has ever found anything to happen without finding that something else happened after it.

The result of this constant and invariable experience is that it is utterly impossible for us to imagine anything to exist without something beyond it, or to imagine anything to happen without something sooner or later happening after it.

Men who are slaves of their imagination therefore do not hesitate to affirm, as we have seen Haeckel to do, that "space is infinite," and they know it to be such, and that succession is eternal, and that the universe has ever existed and will ever continue to exist. In other words, they affirm that space is necessarily infinite, and time, or succession, necessarily eternal.

Mistaking the impotence of their own imagination for a perception of objective reality, they affirm the real and even infinite and eternal existence of what has no real being at all, but is but a creation of the mind. There is no such thing as space or as time either, as we long ago endeavoured to make popularly evident.*

Space is but an idea gained from our experiences of extended things which are said to possess extension. There are plenty of such things, but there is no such "thing" as "extension,"

* "On Truth," pp. 407-410. 1889.

which is but an idea of one of their qualities considered in the abstract. Similarly "space" is a more abstract idea still, and denotes the extension of all extended things abstractedly considered.

Time is but another idea gained from our experience of things which succeed each other, and which are said follow each other in "succession." But there is no such thing as "succession" itself, which is but a name expressing our idea of a quality of such succeeding things considered in the abstract. Similarly, "time" is a more abstract idea still, and denotes the succession of all succeeding things abstractedly considered.

In this frequently existing persuasion, that space and time must be infinite and eternal, we have a supreme example of the fettering effects of the imagination, and of constant and reiterated experience of one definite kind. But not only are our intellectual powers fettered by our sensuous imagination, but the intellect's own freedom of action and facility of perception may be impaired by too constant and repeated a use of it in one special direction or in one limited field only. It is notorious that many men who have long been actively and ably engaged in one kind of study, find a great difficulty when they begin to apply themselves to a very different form of activity, though it be no less intellectual than was their former pursuit.

If we duly bear in mind the hindrances which arise through all these varicus impediments (1) addiction to a special mental activity; (2) a one-sided and invariable past experience, and (3) a failure to distinguish between imagination and conception—between phantasms of the imagination and intellectual perceptions—and the consequences we have seen thence to result in the fields of biology and physics, we shall be prepared for far greater consequences when we turn to questions of religion, nor need we be surprised to find that results are sometimes produced in opposite directions.

We shall not easily discover a better or more naïve example of unconscious blindness produced by the three hindrances just enumerated than that afforded by the pages of Professor Haeckel's work entitled "*Monism*," to which we have before referred.

To their misleading effects he adds that, inexcusable in a

scientific man, of neglecting to inform himself as to the subject matter he discusses. Thus he describes* a Catholic as "One who regards as true exercises of the Christian religion, the adoration of old clothes and wax dolls, and the thoughtless repetition of masses or rosaries." Quite apart from any respect for Christianity, the mere desire to be scientifically accurate should have made it impossible for him to have written, as he has,† concerning "The three 'Divine Persons,' about whose hypostatical [!] union human reason has for eighteen hundred years been tormenting itself in vain."

His conception of what is meant by the term "Personal," as applied to Almighty God, is so absurd as to be almost incredible. Yet he plainly declares‡ that to "recognise in God a personal being," is to recognise, "in other words, an individual of limited extension in space or even of human form," adding,§ that "the anthropomorphic representation of God degraded this loftiest cosmic idea to that of a 'gaseous vertebrate.'" This "loftiest cosmic idea" of his is that of the ether, which he declares|| to be "God the Creator, always in motion."

What must be the necessary result of presenting to the minds of men of the type whereof Haeckel is an extreme example, any such idea as that of Divine Creation? Even apart from anti-Christian prejudice, the fetters of sensuous imagination, which they will not attempt to shake off, must make it utterly unacceptable to them. As to God's act of creation Haeckel at once asks¶ "Whence did he derive the material for it?"

The idea of "creation" is, in the minds of very many men, accompanied and supported by mental phantasmata in which God appears as a human figure performing various manipulatory acts. For many Englishmen, with respect to the creation of animals, the words of Milton have furnished mental images of creatures struggling out of the earth, while the traditional images of the Pictorial Bible for the people during the Middle Ages, have provided a number of mental images which, without being specially attended to and realized, have a more or less

* P. 81.

§ P. 79.

† P. 76.

|| P. 106.

‡ P. 78.

¶ P. 70.

decided action on the imagination. Such things are, of course, also more or less familiar to the opponents of theological doctrines and help to intensify their opposition, because (as we have seen to be the case with Haeckel) they absurdly attribute to the Faithful a real belief in the objective existence of beings and actions exactly corresponding with such symbols—as before pointed out* with respect to similar opposition against a recognition of the soul's existence. Such opponents are far, indeed, from understanding (or at least from admitting they understand) that for the Faithful such symbols merely serve as aids towards the intellectual apprehension of truths which no mental images whatever can in any way truly represent.

The repeated exclamations of triumph at Darwin's success in having banished faith in "special creation," in favour of a belief in "evolution," would be simply ludicrous, but for the fearful amount of moral wreckage that has accompanied the movement.

What the opponents of "special creation" really object to, is simply their own silly imaginations of such unimaginable Divine Activity. Let us suppose that new species arise through changes affecting the germ in the generative organs of parent animals. In that case each such change may be as truly an Act of Divine "special creation" as any other mode of origin, whatever it may be. "Evolution" in no way necessarily excludes "special creation" any more than "special creation" need make "evolution," through eons of time, unnecessary.

It would not be just, however, to blame exclusively irreligious advocates of Darwinism for this confusion of thought. Not a few religious opponents of Darwinism seem to have fallen into the same error, and to have supposed that biological evolution was in necessary opposition to the doctrine of special creation.

But if such errors and misunderstandings can arise with respect to truths closely related to physical existences—such as the existence of the human soul, the creation of the material universe, and that of the various forms of life which people this planet, how much more do the necessary limits of our imaginative faculty give rise to misunderstandings with respect to purely theological truths? With respect to such truths as the

* DUBLIN REVIEW, Jan. 1895, p. 166.

Hypostatic Union of the Divine and Human Natures in Our Lord, the Divine presence in the Holy Eucharist, and that of the Blessed Trinity, not only can the imagination in no way picture them, but the human intellect is utterly inadequate for their comprehension.

Not that we intend to imply—we are indeed most anxious to affirm to the exact contrary—that the supernatural truths of religion are “unknowable” by that intellect any more than that God Himself is “unknowable.” That even the most imperfect apprehension of anything is, after all, “partial truth”—“truth” as far as it goes, and not “falsehood,” is a matter which it is most important to bear in mind, as all must feel sure who have any adequate idea of the enormous mischief which has been done by good, pious and well-meaning men, such as Sir William Hamilton and Mansel, through their pernicious doctrine of the universal and necessary “relativity of knowledge.” About God and about the most mysterious dogmas which he has deigned to reveal to us in Christianity, a multitude of positive characters can be predicated and a corresponding number of truths can be known by us. But though they can be truly known, and with sufficient accuracy for our needs, they can, as before said, be known but most imperfectly as regards their own real objective nature and fulness; while the mental phantasms and the audible, visible or tangible signs and symbols which serve to awaken and sustain our intellectual conceptions in their regard, are infinitely more remote from what they symbolise than is the edge of a razor from the intellect of Scotus.

Thus, certain as it is that our intellect can truly apprehend, to a limited extent, not only what is utterly unimaginable but also what is beyond adequate intellectual comprehension, it is none the less certain that the phantasmata which accompany such apprehensions cannot correspond with objective reality and therefore must be false and, apart from the purpose they legitimately serve, misleading.

With respect to the eucharistic presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, we can sufficiently understand, affirm, believe the Church's doctrine, and make use of it as a guide to our actions; but the nature of that presence we can never imagine, and whatever phantasm with respect to it we may

force our imagination to construct, must be in disaccord with the Divine reality, cannot correspond with objective reality and must, so far, be false.

Hence arises much of the difficulty in accepting Catholic dogmas which is felt by non-Catholics even well-disposed towards Catholicism. The fettering effects of the imagination help to intensify intellectual prejudices previously acquired, and so may occasion a really invincible opposition on the part of religiously minded men. But men like Haeckel—men who oppose and deride Christianity without having made any effort to become acquainted with it—generally base their arguments and misrepresentations on a confusion of mere sensuous symbols with the truths they symbolise, as the writer just named has drawn absurd deductions from the symbolical declaration which affirms that man was created “in the image of God.”

Opponents of religion and upholders of “naturalism” are sometimes singularly inconsistent in that they object to some religious doctrines on the ground that they are just what they should be if the views of such opponents were really true.

Surely nothing can well be more inconsistent than to object to a dogma concerning the Divine nature because it is difficult to understand, while affirming that the ultimate cause and support of all things cannot be understood at all!

Yet some persons who accept such views as those of Mr. Herbert Spencer, object, on these very grounds, to the Christian doctrine of the Blessed Trinity! Surely with their doctrine of “the unknowable” they should be convinced that any possible revelation with respect to the First Cause, could only be stated in terms so mysterious as at first sight to seem irreconcilable and contradictory!

The misleading effect of the imagination (which, as we have seen, so fetters merely physical science), is a terrible bar to the comprehension and acceptance of the supernatural truths of revelation, when those misleading effects are not provided against by a careful explanation of the necessary conditions of all our intellectual activity with a special caution as to limitations in what concerns dogma.

And here we may perhaps be permitted to point out that danger does not exclusively arise from want of attention

to these conditions on the part of those who are ignorant of, or disinclined to the truths of theology. As we before observed,* "its evil effects extend over the whole field of thought, not only degrading the higher conceptions of the biologist and physicist, but even acting very prejudicially on some philosophers and divines."

No doctrines can be affirmed by us save in human language and all human language is composed of sensuous symbols. It is manifest therefore that in every instance there is a possible danger of pressing too strongly the mere symbol, "the letter which killeth," to the detriment of the living truth such "letter" was intended to symbolise. At the very least teachers run a risk of being thus misunderstood, and it is surely desirable that they should be on their guard both against being taken too literally and against allowing themselves to take too literally, teaching they have themselves received. The analogy of the misleading effect which is produced in physical science by neglecting to take carefully into account the effects of the mere imagination is surely very instructive in this connection.

We think that there is a special danger at this moment of such misunderstandings with respect to Biblical criticism. We think there is a danger for non-Catholics of being kept away from the Church and a danger to not a few Catholics of being sorely and unnecessarily distressed. If we are right, it is surely incumbent on us to be on our guard against the ill effects of mistaking symbols for things symbolised. Otherwise we may unconsciously be the means of imposing fetters on the religious conceptions of well-meaning, simple-minded persons. Were we to impose such we might do far more harm than by any mistakes in biological or physical science. Not a few minds amongst the laity are now troubled about the teaching that God himself "composed the Holy Scriptures, and that He is their author," as also that they are "free from all error," and to such a few reflections from a fellow layman may not be altogether unwelcome.

Here the distinction between the sensuous symbol and the thing symbolised appears supremely important. That the

* DUBLIN REVIEW, Jan. 1895, p. 162.

Scriptures were written at the "dictation" of the Holy Ghost is manifestly a metaphorical expression; that God is, as of course he must be, the primary "author" of Scripture does not exclude the co-operation, even the laborious co-operation of the writer. Of course it is manifest to us that the writers wrote those things and those things alone, which God wished them to write; that is to say, the writings were precisely what God wished them to be, and are at this moment precisely what God wishes them to be, and yet no one denies that He has allowed errors to creep in. God has not *inspired* error, but it is plain he inspired men to write, some of whose sayings were erroneous as, *e.g.*, some of the arguments used by the disputants in the book of Job. Evidently therefore inspiration only excludes "formal" and not merely "material" error. But in order to know what would be "formal" error it would be necessary to know the end and purpose of God. As Scotus has said, the Scriptures are to be interpreted by God himself. "*Scripturæ ab Eo sunt interpretandæ a Quo sunt conditæ.*"

That the purpose of the Scriptures was not to teach physical science was made for ever plain by Galileo. But it is certain they could not have served that purpose; for if the physical science of to-day was manifest in the Bible, such teaching would have been worse than useless centuries ago, and would be worse than useless centuries to come. It would have been necessary not only for the Bible to have been the expression of scientific omniscience, but for its readers to have possessed an analogous faculty, or they could have made no use of it in any one age of human history!

It is becoming clearer every day that God did not intend to give us *critical history* as we write it now. Plainly it did not enter into the Divine purpose to give us a complete and exact history of the whole human race from the beginning, nor even a critically accurate history of the tribe of Semites chosen by Him. It is, we have been well assured, a sufficient account of the scope and purpose of the Scriptures to say that their object was to communicate certain truths and facts as a necessary antecedent for the Incarnation and the institution of the Church.

It is wonderful what freedom remains to Catholics after Trent, the Vatican and the recent Encyclical, which latter has not really gone beyond what those councils had previously laid down.

The Pope has not, as I have been given to understand, laid down anything as to authorship, dates, &c., which really conflicts with the duly ascertained results of modern criticism. He has not taught and does not teach us "Biblical criticism." The office of the Church is not to teach science, whether physical or historical. The Pope speaks not as a critic but as a Ruler, whose duty is to watch over the welfare, not of science, but of souls. Had the office of the Church been to teach science she would have failed indeed. But as long as we hold there is a moral ruler above us, and that our deliberate actions in this initial sphere of our existence have everlasting consequences, the Church's action is abundantly justified. All the errors of science, physical or historical, do not weigh in the balance, even infinitesimally, compared with the everlasting destiny of one human soul.

It is with this conviction that we have ventured to call attention to this one, in our eyes most important, aspect of that generally misleading result of failing to distinguish symbols from things signified, and of so avoiding that fettering action of the imagination which has had such misleading consequences in the science of physics, in our conceptions of matters of space and time, in our ideas of the living world and of our own being and above all of the human soul. That we shall ever obtain a thoroughly true conception of the nature of extended bodies we do not believe, nor that the mystery of life, of vital activity, sensation and consciousness will be adequately comprehended by us, though we believe Aristotle's conception (as put forward in our first part) has the greatest probability and will never be bettered.

Of the yet higher truths to which he have ventured to refer, no more complete apprehension can surely be expected. But in each and every case we are profoundly convinced that great good will result from careful consideration of the misleading effects which may be produced by the imagination and the fettering action it may exercise on every form of science accessible to the human mind.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

ART. II.—THE BISHOPS OF EXETER IN THE THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH CENTURIES.

Episcopal Registers of the Diocese of Exeter : Bishop Walter Bronescombe, 1257–1280 ; Bishop Peter Quivil, 1280–1291 ; Bishop Thomas de Bytton, 1292–1307 ; Bishop Walter de Stapeldon, 1307–1326 ; Bishop James de Berkeley, 1327 ; Bishop John de Grandisson, Part I., 1327–1330 ; Bishop Edmund Stafford, 1395–1419. By the Rev. T. C. HINGESTON-RANDOLPH, M.A., Prebendary of Exeter. London : George Bell & Sons. 1886–1894.

THE Bishops of Exeter whose Registers have been placed within our reach in Prebendary Randolph's colossal work—the volumes already published making some 2500 pages mostly in small print—lived in stirring times. The translation of the Roman Court to Avignon, the Schism of the West, the Black Death, the Lollards, the struggles of the nation to achieve its freedom from despotism, all concurred to make the episcopal charge in an English diocese a painful and laborious one. The Bishop had to struggle both with the decay of fervour in his flock and the too often aggressive attitude of the Crown. It has been too much the fashion for Catholics to sigh over the Middle Ages as an embodiment of the peaceful reign of the Church on earth. Father Dalgairns wrote of the later part of those ages, in his admirable book on Holy Communion :

Then came two terrible centuries, most difficult to characterise, the fourteenth and the fifteenth. The world had lost in a great measure the supernatural principles of the true Middle Ages, and had not attained to the Pelagian virtues of modern times. I should call them the most unprincipled centuries of the Christian era.

Now, to form or correct our judgments on the ages that prepared England for the evil days of Henry VIII. and his daughter, we have nothing that can at all compare with the vast collection of documents given to the light by the astonish-

ing labour of the Rev. Mr. Randolph. We give in this article but a few samples culled here and there from this immense repertory, having in view rather to illustrate the splendid virtues which adorned the See of Exeter in Bishops like Grandisson, Stafford or Stapeldon, than to furnish a picture of mediæval ecclesiastical discipline.

Walter Bronescombe, a native of Exeter, is the first of the bishops of that see whose registers have been preserved. On February 23, 1258, Bronescombe was unanimously elected Bishop of Exeter by the Chapter. Though he held at the time of his election the office of chancellor of the cathedral, he was only in deacon's orders. The royal assent was obtained on March 3rd, and on the 9th of the month he was ordained priest at Canterbury, and the next day, being Passion Sunday, was consecrated by the Primate, Blessed Boniface of Savoy. This glorious prelate was the son of Count Thomas of Savoy, and had passed from the Carthusian cloister to the episcopal throne. The extraordinary beauty of his person won for him in his youth the title of "the Absalom of Savoy." Three centuries after his death, when the tomb in which his body reposed at the Abbey of Haute-Combe was opened, it was found still incorrupt. His *cultus* was confirmed by Gregory XVI. The grace of the pastoral office conferred on Walter Bronescombe by the hands of Blessed Boniface bore fruit worthy of his saintly consecrator, to which the register of his episcopate bears ample witness.

A year and nine days after his consecration, on March 19, 1258-59, we find Bishop Bronescombe holding a judicial inquiry in the chapterhouse of Buckfast Abbey, the foundations of which (showing traces of the red sandstone bench that ran round it) have been recently excavated. Abbot Durandus, William de Pontestoke, a Cistercian monk of Buckfast, and several others, were present to assist in the investigation. Bishop Blondy, Bronescombe's predecessor, had left the affairs of the diocese in an unsettled state. But on the present occasion Walter of Loddiswell, priest, and Richard of Totnes, his notary, appeared before the Bishop, and confessed that "in the year 1257 they entered the Bishop's chamber in the night, and found there some of the Bishop's household, clerks and laymen, assembled. These told him the Bishop was dying,

and urged them to arrange the bequeathing of his property, granting of benefices, &c., and that they should draw up and seal deeds to that purpose. All present being sworn to secrecy, they wrote and sealed the papers. Being interrogated whether the Bishop, who was in bed, was alive or dead at the time, they answered that they did not know, but said they did not hear him speak, nor ever saw him alive afterwards. Interrogated who were present, they gave the names of Master John, son of Robert, Master Gervase of Crediton, Caynoc, the Bishop's valets, and others (to the number of eight). Other letters they had written and sealed, after they knew the Bishop was dead." A due canonical penance was imposed, and absolution "*in forma ecclesiæ*" granted to the two who had confessed.

The times needed plainly an energetic Bishop, and no feature of Bishop Bronescombe's government stands out in stronger relief than his indefatigable activity in visiting the farthest corners of the diocese. Here we may as well, as an example, quote a passage from our author's preface:—

Leaving Lawhitton, by Tamar-side, on the 18th or 19th of September, he reached Bodmin on the 20th, and on the same day journeyed to Poltone, where he remained till the 26th, when we find him at St. Newlyn, some miles to the south-west, and the following day at Kenwyn. The 28th and 29th were spent in Truro, and from thence he made his way to Tregony, which he reached on the 30th. There he abode two days, setting out on the 3rd of October for the south coast, and visiting, in rapid succession, a large number of places, some of which are not altogether easy of access even now, and must have been much less so over such roads as the good Bishop and his retinue had to encounter more than six hundred years ago. He visited St. Anthony in Roseland on the 3rd, St. Michael Carhayes and Tregeare on the 5th, Mevagissey and Bodrigan on the 8th, St. Austell on the 9th, and Looe, many miles over the hills eastward, on the 11th. That night he reached St. Germans Priory and spent the next day there, proceeding to Shevioke on the 13th, Antony on the 14th, the remote parish of Rame, on the 15th, Pillaton (miles away to the north, and by a very circuitous route) on the 16th, St. Mellion on the 17th, Botunfleming on the 18th, St. Dominick on the 20th, North Petherwin (far away in North Cornwall beyond Launceston) on the 22nd, St. Clether on the 23rd, Kelly, across the Tamar, on the 24th, and St. Stephens-by-Launceston on the 25th!

Truly the zeal of the house of God had eaten him up, for the above is the work of less than two months. Then in every

town and village churches were being built in the beautiful architecture of the thirteenth century. But when we find him consecrating twenty-one churches in thirty days it is time to cease from our account of his labours. Such was an English bishop in the days when Henry III. was fighting the barons, and Edward I. contending with Bruce for the kingdom of Scotland.

Henry III. died in 1271, and not till three years later did his son Edward return from the Holy Land. The absence of the king invariably let loose the licence of the barons. Bishop Bronescombe in a document dated May 9th, 1273, while deferring for a time sentence of excommunication, commands that in the Cathedral of Exeter, and all collegiate and parochial churches, with ringing of bells and with lighted candles, denunciations be published against the sacrilegious violence of the knights and others in the service of Edmund, Earl of Cornwall. These ruffians had broken into St. Alan's Church in Cornwall, and, in the sanctuary and at the altar, had shed the blood of the clergy, dragged them at their horses' tails, and defaced with their swords the priestly tonsure. As the powerful earl was the son of Richard, King of the Romans, and was the king's cousin, sentence of excommunication was deferred, "out of reverence to our Lord the King, now absent." The earl's brother submitted at once, and Edmund himself gave full satisfaction to the Bishop, as appears from subsequent documents. No wonder that Bishop Bronescombe bewails the calamitous state of the Church in his days.

Six years before Bishop Bronescombe's death we find him with his beloved Archbishop, Boniface of Savoy, among the Fathers of the Ecumenical Council of Lyons. And here we may remark that if any one looking through these registers still doubt if England in those days were Roman Catholic he has clean taken leave of his senses. The Bishop was at Bayonne when Queen Eleanor gave birth to a son on St. Clement's Day, 1274. He baptised the royal infant on the next day. Prince Alfonso only lived ten years, and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

Bishop Bronescombe died on the 22nd of July 1280.

He rests under the beautiful tomb which serves as a screen between the Lady Chapel and his own chapel of St. Gabriel, immediately opposite

the tomb of Bishop Edmund de Stafford, which also serves as a screen under the corresponding arch on the north side. His effigy and the slab which supports it are of early date, and were probably erected immediately after his death. But the altar tomb and the gorgeous canopy overshadowing it closely resemble those of Bishop Stafford, and must have been erected early in the fifteenth century.

The limits of space oblige me to pass over the shorter registers of Bishops Quivil and Bytton.

Walter de Stapeldon's episcopate coincides with the reign of the unfortunate Edward II., the Bishop's election following a few months on Edward's accession, and his murder preceding the dethronement of his Sovereign by a brief space. Statesman and Bishop at once, his heroic loyalty to his King only renders more conspicuous his zeal for the House of God, in the minutest details of his sacred office.

Walter de Stapeldon, we read in our author's preface, was a Devonshire man, born at Annery, in the parish of Monkleigh, about 1260. He was the son of William and Mabel de Stapeldon. His elder brother, Sir Richard, was a puisne judge of the King's Bench, and we find Bishop de Stapeldon occasionally visiting him at Stapeldon Manor, in the parish of Cookbury. Walter studied at Oxford, where he also taught canon law, was rector of Aveton Giffard, being Canon of Exeter as early as 1302, and succeeded William de Puntingdon as Precentor. On the 6th of October, 1307, he was elected Bishop of Exeter. His troubles began at once. Blessed Boniface of Savoy had gone to his rest, and Archbishop Winchelsey was a man of a very different stamp, and was, in fact, at this time in France, suspended from his office by the Holy See, which suspension was removed at Poitiers by the Pope on the 15th of January following. As some troublesome ecclesiastic had appealed against Stapeldon's election, it was not confirmed till March 13th. It is plain that Stapeldon had enemies, and we find him some years previously engaged in a serious and violent dispute with the Dominicans of Exeter, by whom he was accused of having broken down the screen in their church and various other acts of aggression. The confirmation of his election did not end his difficulties. The Archbishop had come back to England, evidently not in the most peaceable frame of mind, and poor Stapeldon, who was penniless, writes in despair :

The monks of Canterbury tell me that they will not allow any Bishop-elect in the province to be consecrated anywhere else than in the Church of Canterbury. This is very hard on me; I am *in puris et nudis*, the storehouses of the manors are empty; though the crops are in the fields they were sown during the vacancy, and belong to the king.

In this harassing anxiety he sent his brother Robert to Canterbury to obtain leave to be consecrated somewhere else. The prior and monks were not unwilling, but when Robert began to plead with the Archbishop, that prelate interrupted him at his first word, and, "with his usual violence," writes Stapeldon, "said he would not grant us or any one what our messenger asked, adding other things which, out of respect for him, we will not repeat, and saying he was astonished we had not come to him in person to ask about the time of our consecration." Meanwhile Queen Isabella was importuning him for a prebend in behalf of a favourite chaplain, and an annual pension in the meanwhile. The Bishop-elect refused to promise a prebend as being uncanonical, but gave out of his poverty a small pension. At last, on October 13, 1308, he was consecrated at Canterbury, at which time he was in such straits that he had to ask his Brother-elect of Worcester (Reynolds) to pay their joint expenses, even for meat and drink.

Once consecrated, his energy in diocesan work carried on the traditions of Bishop Bronescombe. At his first ordination held at Crediton, he ordained the astonishing number of 1005, including those who received minor orders. The names of all are given in the Register, and these ordination registers enable us to know the names of the choir-monks at Buckfast, Tavistock, Torre and the other monastic communities in the diocese. On another occasion, the Bishop finds that an unlucky candidate, presented by the Abbot of Buckfast, could not sing, so his ordination is deferred till he learns his plain chant properly. The examiners on this occasion must have been specially interested in chant, for six others come under the same sentence: "Not to be admitted to orders, unless they know how to sing." "As he cannot sing he is not to have his ordination papers till he learns, *quousque sciverit*." Now and then some one is ordained on the special condition that he is not to hear confessions except *in articulo mortis*. The list of

Bishop Stapeldon's ordinations occupies ninety small-print pages of the volume before us. Several were held in the diocese of Winchester.

Before passing to the great political events in which Bishop Stapeldon took part towards the close of his stormy episcopate, we meet with a very pleasing insight into his paternal care for the nuns of his diocese. The two communities, of Benedictine nuns and Canonesses of St. Augustine, now near neighbours at Teignmouth and Abbotsleigh, were in Stapeldon's time represented by the communities at Polslo and Canonsleigh. Polslo was in the neighbourhood of Exeter, and among its chief benefactors had numbered, in former days, Tracy, the murderer of St. Thomas. Canonsleigh was in the deanery of Tiverton. The Bishop's instructions are in Norman-French, which was, I suppose, still the language spoken in England by ladies of rank. The nuns were not then enclosed, as they are at present. The orders given by Bishop Stapeldon to the two communities are in part similar. He decrees that silence be kept according to the rule, in the parts of the monastery where speaking is not allowed; and if it is necessary to speak it must be in a whisper, "and had best be in Latin, even though it be not good Latin according to the rules of grammar." Next, the Bishop orders them to keep with all solemnity the Feast of Corpus Christi, then recently instituted, and, after various regulations on monastic discipline, goes at length into the subject of going on journeys outside the monastery. This is not to be allowed oftener than once a year, to visit their friends or relations, with leave of the Prioress, and with a professed nun for companion, chosen by the Prioress and not by the nun herself, and she must not go out on two several times with the same companion. If a nun (of Polslo) only goes on out to dine at Exeter, she must have besides her companion, a clerk, chaplain, or esquire of good reputation appointed by the Prioress, who must go and return with them, and not go from one hostelry to another "as they have sometimes done," adds the Bishop. We must not forget we are in the age of Chaucer.

Bishop Stapeldon's activity in the visitation of his diocese rivalled that of his predecessor, Bishop Bronescombe. The fact already related of his ordaining on one single occasion 1005 individuals gives us an idea that his physical strength

must have been great. It is true, he was then only in his forty-eighth year. Among his greatest works are the progress he made with his glorious cathedral, and the foundation of Stapeldon Hall, now Exeter College, at Oxford. The original statutes of the latter are given in full from the single MS. extant, by Prebendary Randolph, as drawn up by the great Bishop. He did little actual building with the nave of his Cathedral, preparing the work for Bishop Grandisson, but he made the choir a work of dazzling magnificence. The markets and fairs of Ashburton, two miles from Buckfast, obtained by Bishop Stapeldon, are still maintained there, and his foundation of St. Laurence's School is still flourishing, though St. Laurence's Guild and Chantry have disappeared with the disappearance of the Faith that inspired them.

But we must hasten on to the great catastrophe. During the second half of his episcopate, Stapeldon was kept constantly employed by the King in affairs of the State. The royal and papal letters concerning the disputes between Edward and Bruce are given at length from the Exeter Registers. Bishop Stapeldon, with the Earl of Pembroke and Henry de Beaumont, opened the Parliament held at York in the eventful year of Bannockburn. He narrowly escaped death from the partisans of the "She-wolf of France" when in that country as royal envoy. The Bishop did his best to save the King from the headlong ruin into which his affection for the De Spensers was hurrying him, and the letter published in this volume throws much light on the history of the events that brought about Edward's tragical end. Stapeldon's remonstrances made him incur the temporary disfavour of his Sovereign.

In that Sovereign's quarrel he was to die. Edward fled from London into Wales, leaving the custody of the Tower in the hands of the Bishop of Exeter. From three ancient accounts of the Bishop's murder, given by our author, we select that compiled at St. Alban's.

Continuing their rage, the citizens made a rush for the house of the Bishop of Exeter, Master Walter de Stapeldon, and setting fire to the gates, quickly forced an entrance. But not finding the Bishop, whose destruction was their object, they carried off his jewels, plate and furniture. It happened, however, in an evil hour, that the Bishop came back from the country; who, although he had been forewarned of their evil

designs, felt no manner of dread of the citizens. So he rode on, with all boldness, till he reached the north door of St. Paul's, where he was forthwith seized by the raging people, who struck at and wounded him, and finally, having dragged him from his horse, hurried him away to the place of execution. When they had dragged him as far as Cheapside, they then proclaimed him to be a traitor to the State, a seducer of the King and a destroyer of the liberties of their city. Now the Bishop had on a kind of armour, which was commonly called an *acton*; and having stripped him of that, and of all his garments, they cut off his head. Two others, members of his household, his esquire and his valet, suffered the same fate. Having perpetrated this sacrilegious deed, they fixed the Bishop's head on a tall stake, by way of trophy, to be to all beholders a lasting memorial of their crime. As to the Bishop's corpse, they flung it without any funeral rites like that of an excommunicated man, into a small pit in a certain old cemetery, then altogether disused, which had belonged, formerly to the brothers who used to be called the *Frères Pyes* (*White Frères* or *Frères de la Pie*, according to William de Pakyngton). The cause of all this bitter enmity was, that when he was Treasurer of the Kingdom, he procured of the King's Council that the Justices in Eyre should sit within the City of London; and so it fell out that the citizens, because they had committed many offences, were subjected to manifold punishment, as they had deserved. It was also alleged against him that he had collected a great multitude of soldiers against the Queen.

Those murdered with him were William Waulle, his nephew, and John Paddington. Stapeldon was riding to take sanctuary in St. Paul's when he was seized by the mob.

So died the loyal, munificent and exemplary Walter de Stapeldon. He was buried in St. Clement Dane's, and his body was removed to Exeter in the following year. His murder shows that reverence for the Church was greatly on the wane in England. And here we must take leave of Stapeldon's Register. It contains, among other papal documents, the complete texts of the bull of canonisation of St. Thomas of Hereford, and a bull of Clement V. against tournaments.

James de Berkeley was the next Bishop. His episcopate lasted only three months, but the circumstances attending his election are worthy of the attention of those among our Anglican friends who may still doubt if the Pope's authority was in full activity in England in mediæval times. We need only sum up Prebendary Randolph's historical notice.

Immediately after Bishop Stapeldon's murder, Archbishop Reynolds committed the care of the vacant diocese to Adam de

Murimuth, Canon of Exeter, who, by his *Chronicle*, takes a place among the historians of England. On the 5th of December, 1326, the Chapter unanimously elected James, third son of Thomas, Lord Berkeley, by Joan, daughter of William de Ferrers, Earl of Derby. The royal assent was given on the 12th. Meanwhile Pope John XXII. at Avignon had, on the 24th of the previous month, announced in consistory that he reserved to himself the right of providing to the vacant See of Exeter, and sent his commissaries to England to announce the reservation. They reached Dover on the 10th of December, proceeding at once to Canterbury. The King took alarm, and wrote to the Pope from Kenilworth on the 18th of December, as well as to several cardinals, petitioning his Holiness not to insist on the reservation. "The Pope," writes our author, "solved the difficulty, not by foregoing his reservation, but by giving it in favour of the Bishop-elect." But Berkeley died in three months, on the 24th of June. The King at once wrote to the Pope, asking him to confer the dignity of Bishop of Exeter on Thomas de Cherletone, Canon of York. The Chapter meanwhile elected John de Godeleghe, Canon of Exeter and Dean of Wells. But John XXII. at once appointed John de Grandisson, who was consecrated at Avignon, together with John de Cherletone, Elect of Hereford, by Peter, Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina. Hereon Prebendary Randolph writes:

Whatever may be thought of these proceedings by those who have no sympathy with Papal claims, they were, at any rate, justified by the result. It was a good and wise choice, and gave to Exeter the most devoted and illustrious of her Bishops. The new Bishop found his whole diocese distressed and disordered. His Cathedral Church was unfinished, and the work of recasting the nave, which had been begun by Stapeldon, and suddenly cut short by his lamentable death, demanded immediate measures to save it from dilapidation and ruin. The ordinary duties of the clergy, in the remoter parts of Cornwall, were sorely neglected, while discipline even in the Cathedral itself, was all but suspended. But he plunged into his work bravely and eagerly, without a moment's delay that could be avoided, grudging even the few days that were occupied by necessary formalities, and spurning the attractions of the Court and the flattery and praise of men. He could not rest till he was united to his Spouse; and when he had once taken possession of his diocese, it was found almost impossible to induce him to leave it again, through all his long episcopate, and he devoted his days with untiring energy, unflinching self-sacrifice, and conspicuous success to its reformation and

good government. But I must reserve my detailed account of his life and labours for my preface to the Third Part of this edition of his Register. If I am spared to complete my task, all my materials will, then, be displayed in order before me, and I may hope to do justice, in some measure to the memory of so great a man.

I shall not enter on a review of the part, already published, of Bishop Grandisson's Register. It is a splendid collection, of absorbing interest, the letters and documents being given in full. But the whole Register deserves an article to itself, as if I may judge from this part it illustrates both the ecclesiastical and monastic discipline of the age in an extraordinary degree.

Bishop Stafford's Register is of later date (A.D. 1395–1419). It was the first one published by our indefatigable editor. We must dismiss it briefly, having reached our limits.

Edmund de Stafford was the son of Sir Richard de Stafford (who was summoned to Parliament as Baron Stafford de Clifton in 1371), by his first wife, daughter of Sir Richard de Vernon. His episcopal consecration, by Archbishop Courtenay, took place on the 20th of June 1395. One of the most interesting features of his Register is the collection of Wills which it contains, and which fill 45 pages in small type. I find one John Fardell, of Buckfastleigh, leaving 26s. 8d., a large sum in those days, to buy an "Ordinal" for the parish church, and to the monks of the Abbey of Buckfast, 13s. 4d., "that they may pray for him there." John de Shillingford, Canon of Exeter, wishes to be buried in St. Catherine's Chapel, Widdicombe-in-the-moor (not far from my own monastery), "that where I had my first welcome, I may receive my last farewell" (*Ut ubi habui primum salve ibi recipiam ultimum vale*).

I am sensible that I am far from having done justice to the energy, ability, and candour displayed in this truly noble work. If it modifies any too fond and roseate views people may have entertained of the Middle Ages, it yet shows with tenfold splendour the power of the Church in battling with the world in times to the full as dangerous as those in which we live. And for this and many other reasons, we owe a debt of lasting gratitude to Prebendary Randolph-Hingeston.

ADAM HAMILTON, O.S.B.

ART. III.—THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

ONE of the most perplexing problems connected with the Book of Daniel arises out of the fact that it contains a long section, extending to about one half the entire work, written in the Aramaic dialect.* Why is this so? Was the book originally in Hebrew throughout? Or in Aramaic? Or was it from the first, as it is now, bi-lingual? Needless to say, many explanations have been hazarded to account for the presence of two dialects in Daniel; but most of them are very far from being convincing.

It is weak to suggest that the Chaldaean sages are introduced, addressing the king in Aramaic (ii. 46), because such was the court language of Babylon; and that then the writer, through inadvertence, continues to write in Aramaic to the end of the seventh chapter. For, to say nothing of the rather grotesque supposition that the writer should have been guilty of such gross and reckless want of care, it is pretty certain that not Aramaic, but the Babylonian, which is found in the Babylonian contracts and inscriptions, would have been employed on such an occasion.

Father Knabenbauer, S.J.,† who supports the traditional view as to the authorship and date of Daniel, suggests that those prophecies which it was of importance for both Jews and Babylonians to know, were composed in Aramaic, a dialect intelligible to a considerable number of both peoples; the later prophecies, as being of interest chiefly to the Jews, he recorded in Hebrew, the ordinary language of the prophetic writers.

From chap. i. 21 [he writes] it is clear that this chapter was written in the first year of Cyrus. It is, however, very unlikely that up to that year Daniel committed nothing to writing. On the contrary, it is highly probable that he wrote down the events recorded in chapters 2, 3, &c. at once; and that—because it was of equal importance for Jews and Babylonians to know them—he used a dialect which was certainly familiar to many of both nations. But when later on he recorded in writing those revelations and oracles which concerned the Jews alone,

* Chaps. i.-ii., 4a, viii.-xii. are in Hebrew; chaps. iv. 46-vii. are in Aramaic.

† "Commentarius in Daniele," p. 18.

he employed, as did the other prophets, the Hebrew tongue. The same language he employed, when he collected the prophecies he had written down at various times into one volume, prefixing to them by way of introduction I. 1 and the following verses. In this volume such sections as has had been already written and published in Aramaic were inserted in the same language.

The above explanation is built upon the supposition that the Book of Daniel, as it now exists, proceeded from the prophetic writer in the days of the captivity; and from such a standpoint it has doubtless much to recommend it. A considerable difficulty, however, arises from the fact that the Hebrew does not leave off at the end of the first chapter, where one would naturally expect the preface to close; and that the Aramaic does not begin with a new context, but abruptly in the middle of a narrative.

Mr. Bevan seeks for an explanation of the problem in a different direction. He is of opinion that the Book of Daniel was originally written in Hebrew throughout; that afterwards an Aramaic translation was made; and that the Aramaic section, which the present Hebrew text contains, is part of that translation.

Hence [he writes],* the hypothesis that Daniel was originally written in Hebrew throughout, is quite in accordance with analogy. At the same time we have to remember that the author lived in a time of intense excitement, and his book was evidently meant, not for a small circle, but for all "the holy people" (see especially xi. 33; xii. 3). His object was to produce an immediate and powerful effect. Since, however, the Hebrew language was then unintelligible to the vulgar, or very imperfectly understood by them, the need of a translation would at once be felt. We cannot therefore regard it as improbable that the author himself, or one of his associates, issued an Aramaic version of the book, or at least of some parts of it. In any case the style of the Hebrew and of the Aramaic portions is so similar that we may confidently pronounce them to be products of the same school, if not of the same pen. But if the book was originally written throughout in Hebrew, why, it may be asked, has it reached us in its present form? The most plausible supposition is that a portion of the Hebrew text having been lost, a scribe filled up the gap by borrowing from the Aramaic version.

In fact, Mr. Bevan conjectures that during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes,† when a systematic attempt was being

* "The Book of Daniel," p. 27.

† Reigned from 176-164 B.C.

made to destroy all the copies of the Law ; and when as yet only a few copies of Daniel existed part of the Hebrew text was lost or destroyed ; and that the omissions had to be made up from the Aramaic version. Mr. Bevan would, of course, hold the Book of Daniel to belong to the time of Antiochus (176-164) (p. 23) ; but in this he would but be following the almost unanimous verdict of critical scholarship. Professor Cheyne fixes the date as between December 165 and June 164 : * though Dr. Driver contents himself with laying down that while the book could not have been composed before the year 300 B.C., probably it belonged to B.C. 168 or 167. †

There seems to be little doubt that the language of Daniel manifests a comparatively late date ; in fact, that there are in it many indications of the Greek or Macedonian period. There are a considerable number of Persian words, ‡ which would seem to point to a date when Persia had grown to be a great power and had made its influence felt throughout the East. There are even some words of Greek origin ; and do not these indicate a period after the Conquests of Alexander the Great, when Greek customs and arts and civilization began to be known and appreciated in Asia ? § Nor is this all. The Hebrew of Daniel is unlike that of pre-exilic times ; nor has it even much in common with that of the post-exilic prophets. It approximates more closely to that of Esther and the Books of Chronicles ; even to the Rabbinical Hebrew. Finally, the Aramaic of Daniel is not the Eastern Aramaic of Mesopotamia, Syria and Babylonia, which might be expected from one writing in Babylonia in the sixth century B.C. ; but the Western Aramaic of the Jewish Targums and the Palestinian Talmud. It must not be imagined, however, that because Greek influence in Asia began, it may be said, with the Conquests of Alexander the Great, no Greek words had found their way into the Semitic languages before that date. There may be, and doubtless there are, many Hebrew words of Greek origin, which formed part of the Hebrew language long before the days of the Babylonian captivity. This influence of Greek upon

* "Founders of Old Testament Criticism," p. 369.

† "Literature of the Old Testament," p. 467.

‡ Probably at least 15, cf. Driver, p. 469.

§ Note especially the musical terms קִיתָרִים כַּסְנִתִּינִי כֹמֶפְנִיָה

Hebrew may have had place in many ways ; here it will suffice to suggest one, alluded to by the late M. Renan, an acknowledged authority upon the Semitic languages.

It is rarely [he writes]* that a great influence exercised by one nation over another does not leave its trace in the words. Many Philistine words were doubtlessly introduced into Hebrew in the days of David. The language of the Philistines was, as we have said, a Pelasgic dialect, inclining now towards Greek, now towards Latin. We are led to believe that it is to this profound influence of the Philistines upon Israel, towards the year one thousand before Jesus Christ, that we should ascribe the introduction into the Hebrew tongue of these words of Greek and Latin appearance, almost exclusively referring to military or erotic things, which are met with in the most ancient texts. Such are *prbv* or *prbl*, where I fancy I recognise the word *peribolos*, the circuit of the fortifications of a city, the precinct, *mekéra*, equivalent to *machæra*, a dagger ; perhaps *mekona*, which would be the same as *machina* ; *liska* which has quite the sense of *lesché* ; *captor*, which recalls *capitul*, the capital (of a pillar), and above all the singular word *pellea*, with the sense of courtesan, which has existed in the Semitic languages from a very remote epoch.

If words of apparently Greek origin found their way into the Semitic languages as early as the tenth century B.C., it would certainly be, to say the least, rash to assign a late date to a writing, merely because it contains words which seem connected with the Greek. Nor ought the fact to be overlooked, that very often words of temptingly Hellenic appearance may turn out after all to be really of quite different origin. Thus, does not Professor Sayce make it very likely † that *appiryón* (Song of Songs, iii. 9), usually taken to be the Greek word *φορῆιον*, is really connected with the Assyrian *aparné* ; and that *pardes*, so like the Greek *παράδεισος*, may really be a corruption for *παρῆς*, from the Assyrian *pir'su*, meaning a " garden ? "

These facts will no doubt make one slow to decide the age of a Hebrew writing, on the ground merely of the presence in it of a certain number of words, seemingly of Greek origin. There are, however, in the Book of Daniel two words which seem to be Greek, סומפניה and פסנתרין—names apparently of musical instruments—and which are said to imply a degree of civilization and knowledge of harmony not likely, to say the least, to

* " Histoire du Peuple d'Israel," vol. ii. p. 33.

† " Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 491.

have existed in Greece in the sixth century before Christ. In fact, as Professor Sayce shows,* at that time, the arts and inventions of civilized life streamed from the East into Greece, rather than from Greece into the East: and hence it is hardly probable that such words as those given above should have found their way from Greek to Hebrew in the sixth century B.C.

But here comes in the importance of the explanation given by Mr. Bevan and other writers of the presence in Daniel of a large section written in Aramaic. If the Aramaic chapters contain merely a translation of the original work, then all calculations based on the character of the Aramaic are entirely beside the question as to when the Hebrew edition of Daniel was first committed to writing. If a certain number of Persian and Greek words are found in the Aramaic, the most that can be deduced from their presence is that the translation cannot have been made before such and such a date. Now the words פסנפרין, סומפניה, and קיתרס occur exclusively in the Aramaic chapters of Daniel; and hence have no bearing on the date of the original work. Doubtless the Greek, with which one of them is connected (*συμφωνία*), was a word well known in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and probably at his court.† But the most that can be argued from the presence of these words in Daniel is that the Aramaic translation was made “after the dissemination of Greek influences in Asia through the conquests of Alexander the Great.”‡

If, however, the Aramaic of Daniel does not give any clue to the date at which the book was composed, how is it as to the Hebrew sections? For are not the Hebrew chapters parts of the Book, as it left the author's hand? And does not the Hebrew of Daniel betray signs of late authorship? Is it not unlike the Hebrew of the sixth century before Christ?

It may be said [writes Mr. Bevan §] that the Hebrew style of Daniel differs widely from that of exilic and pre-exilic times, and agrees, in its main features, with the latest historical prose in the Old Testament, while in some important details it approximates to the Hebrew of the Mishnah and the Talmud. At the same time the author borrows many isolated words and phrases from the Pentateuch and the Prophets, and this is precisely what we might expect to find in a book written by a Jew of the Macedonian age in the name of an ancient seer.

* *Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1878.

‡ Driver, *l.c.* p. 471.

† “Polybius,” book xxvi.

§ *Op. cit.* p. 32.

Does then the character of the Hebrew in Daniel settle the question as to when it was written and assign it decisively to the Maccabean age? It would not seem so.

There was no practice more common among Hebrew writers, according to the teaching of modern critical science, than that of the revision or recasting of sacred writings. Thus of the Hexateuch, which the sopherîm had "produced" "before the end of the fifth century,"* Kuenen writes that "the text . . . not only here and there, but throughout, was handled with a certain freedom in the third century, and yet more so previously, being still subject to what its guardians considered amendments." The redaction of the Hexateuch he regards "as a labour that was only provisionally closed at first, and was long subsequently continued and rounded off." In fact "the redaction of the Hexateuch assumes the form of a continuous diaskeue or diorthosis." The same is the case with the Book of Judges, which we have now, not in its primitive shape, but in a "revised form."† Wellhausen writes also: "The comprehensive revision which we noticed in the Book of Judges has left its mark on the Books of Samuel too" (p. 245). Yes, and the redaction of Kings was uniform with that of Judges and Samuel (p. 277). That this process of re-editing was not wanting among the prophets is also a recognised tenet of modern criticism. Indeed, to such an extent does it sometimes go that, as Professor Kirkpatrick says of Jeremiah:‡ "There can be little doubt that the book existed in what we may call a longer and a shorter recension, the former of which is represented by the Hebrew text, and the latter by the Septuagint."

Such being the not uncommon practice of Jewish writers, it would not be surprising to find that Daniel had been "rounded off" many years after it had first been written. Nor are there wanting reasons for thinking it likely, on the supposition that the traditional view of the part played by Daniel during his lifetime is correct, that later editors put their hands to his work. For Daniel is recorded to have been taken into the

* Kuenen, "The Hexateuch," p. 314.

† Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," p. 232.

‡ "Divine Library," p. 21.

service of the king of Babylon at an early age.* There he was instructed in the language and learning of the Chaldæans. He lived chiefly with the Babylonians; he was a high official at the king's court; he did not see much of his own countrymen; and it is not unnatural to suppose that his Hebrew, though doubtless he was acquainted with that language, had a decidedly Babylonian flavour. The Hebrew sopherim might well therefore have taken it in hand to correct it, and the result would have been the Hebrew of Daniel as it now exists—having certain phraseological and verbal affinities with the Pentateuch and older prophetic writings; betraying in many respects the hand of a later writer, and containing a stray Babylonian word here and there.†

Does it then appear that Daniel wrote the book that bears his name, practically in its present form; and that, at a later date, say in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the work was polished up in style and translated into Aramaic. Such is not the view maintained here. On that supposition, the difficulty would remain to account for the absence of Daniel from the list of great men given in the Book of Ecclesiasticus. And, moreover, it would leave the bilingual character of Daniel still a mystery. For though on the supposition that, in its completed form, the Book of Daniel had not existed many years, at the time of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, and, consequently, that but few copies existed, it is quite reasonable to suppose, with Mr. Bevan, that part of the Hebrew text got lost or destroyed, and only survived in the Aramaic translation; still, such a supposition would be extremely unlikely, if the book had been in existence as early as the sixth century B.C. How then is it proposed to account for the Book of Daniel in its present form?

The abbé Loisy writes as follows respecting the Book of Daniel, in his work upon the history of the Old Testament Canon, p. 40.

Daniel, selon toutes les probabilités, n'acquit de notoriété en Palestine que dans le cours du second siècle avant notre ère, à une époque où la collection des prophètes était depuis longtemps arrêtée: c'est pourquoi

* Dr. Driver writes, "Daniel, it cannot be doubted, was a historical person," "Lit. of O. T.," p. 479.

† There are only a few Babylonian words, cf. Bevan, p. 40.

[No. 15 of *Fourth Series*.]

il n'a pu s'y introduire : on peut croire, ce me semble, dit l'abbé Glaire, tout en admettant, comme je le fais, la parfaite authenticité du livre de Daniel, que ce recueil, ayant été formé à Babylone, et peut-être après la mort de l'auteur, aura été apporté un peu tard à Jerusalem, et n'aura pu trouver sa place qu'à la suite des autres ouvrages dont se composait déjà le canon (Introduction (éd. 1868) t. 1, p. 53).

The same idea had been already put forward by M. Quatremère in the *Journal des Savants* (Oct. 1845), and Ubaldi appears to think it not without support from the internal characteristics of the book.* Indeed many of the new critical school regard Daniel as based on earlier writings. Thus, to quote Professor Cheyne, "Reuss and Lagarde both held that the book was made up of a number of separate "fly-sheets," and Dr. C. H. H. Wright maintains that it is but an abridgment of a larger work."† Dr. Driver admits that "perhaps written materials were at the disposal of the author" (p. 479).

It is not unreasonable to suppose that Daniel the prophet committed to writing a number of prophecies both during the exile and after. In this he would but be acting in conformity with the not uncommon prophetic practice. For we know that many of the prophets committed their prophecies to writing; and that prophets kept the records of the kingdoms of Juda and Israel. But the fact that he lived in comparative isolation from his people; that he did not, like an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, spend his life in presence of his fellow countrymen; that he did not address them in season and out of season; and rejoice in their joys and mourn in their sorrows, would account for no collection of his writings having been published at an early date. There was no doubt some informal collection from the first, which may have been included in the library collected by Nehemias (2 Macc. ii. 13-17). But there was no school formed by him to insist upon their immediate publication; to impress their importance on the people. There was no popular cry for them, raised by those whom he had so often moved to enthusiasm, penance, fervour by his words. So perhaps they lay in the archives of Jerusalem; studied, it may be, by a few, unknown to the many. And so the name

* "Introductio in Sac. Scripturam," vol. ii. p. 156,

† "Founders of O. T. Criticism," p. 359.

of Daniel, little thought of, was passed over in silence by the writer of Ecclesiasticus.

Then came sad times for Israel in the days of the Greek ascendancy. Perhaps it may have been in the time of the arch-persecutor Antiochus Epiphanes, who endeavoured to hellenize Israel; to destroy the dominion of Jehovah; to establish a new kingdom, based on paganism. Ridicule, contempt, persecution, death were the lot of the faithful Jew; safety, promotion, honour the reward of the renegade. Jehovah seemed conquered by a Gentile king, and doubtless many a heart grew faint in Israel.

Now it was, perhaps, that some learned scribe in Jerusalem conceived the design of sending forth among the people the prophecies of the seer Daniel. Their reference to the crisis through which they were passing seemed undoubted. Doubtless they would do much to restore men's confidence in God—to animate them in their conflict with Gentile wickedness; for in them they would see the victories of Jehovah over Nebuchadnezzar and other great men of old; and, it was obvious for them to conclude, that as He had triumphed before, so now again He could give victory to the weak over the strong.

In thus publishing the prophecies of Daniel, the editor was acting with a set purpose and object in view—viz., to strengthen his fellow-countrymen in their conflict with Antiochus; to preserve them from idolatry; and to keep them in their allegiance with Jehovah. The Book of Daniel, in fact, came into being (under the influence of course of Divine Inspiration) like the other books of the Old Testament, to supply a want. Was not the Book of Judges written to keep the Israelites in the observance of the Law, by showing how God punished the people when they fell into idolatry, and lent them His help when they sincerely repented? * And may it not be said that the editors of Samuel and Kings wrote with the same object in view? † Or, perhaps, as Cornely supposes, ‡ Samuel was written to show the fidelity of God towards Israel; and Kings to exhibit his justice, in the destruction of the two kingdoms. In

* Cornely, "Introductio," p. 229. Wellhausen, "Proleg.," p. 228, &c.

† Wellhausen, p. 241.

‡ *Loc. cit.*, p. 241, 249.

any case, these books were all published for a fixed purpose, important to the people at the time in which they were written. None of them pretend to be complete histories, written merely to make known the story of the past; they set forth past events before the reader, only in so far as is necessary to carry out the object of the writer.

The editor of Daniel acts in the same way. It is not necessary to suppose that he introduced into his volume all the prophecies of Daniel. He may have omitted some, because they were not necessary for his purpose; he may only be giving a small part of what was in reality a large volume of writings; he may, in fact, have compiled the Book of Daniel much in the same way as the writings of the other prophets are acknowledged to have been compiled. For no one supposes that in the case of the prophetic books we are in possession of a full report of the writings of the prophets. Thus Father Cornely says:* “Most of the prophetic books seem to be only an epitome of the discourses which the prophets delivered, *viva voce*, before the people”; and Professor Kirkpatrick expresses the same idea from another point of view: “Some of the discourses,” he writes,† “are only condensed summaries of teaching which extended over considerable periods, and others in all probability notes, and sometimes fragmentary notes, of their master’s teaching, preserved by the prophet’s disciples.”

If such a view as we have been sketching of the origin of the Book of Daniel be founded on reason and probability, many of the chief difficulties urged against its authenticity will fall to the ground.

(1) Its position in the Jewish Canon would be accounted for. For, though Daniel may have committed much to writing, still his prophecies had not been formed into a published volume; and hence they were not received into the Canon of the Prophets when that volume was closed, perhaps in the time of Nehemias.

(2) The omission of the name of “Daniel” among the worthies of Israel by Siracides in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, would also be accounted for. Because he had not yet attained to that fame which he acquired in later days, when his name

* “Introductio,” p. 369.

† “Divine Library,” p. 16.

went forth with his prophecies among the people and became a household word with all.

(3) The general argument from language would cease to have any force. Such a term as the "Chaldæans" might well have been introduced by the later editor, as a well-known name for a certain class of magicians; and, though not in use in the sixth century B.C., it may accurately express a class existing at that time. Moreover, the age and circumstances of the editor may account for mis-spells occurring in proper names; to the same cause may be perhaps assigned the confusion sometimes existing in the matter of etymology—for if the editor of Daniel lived at a time when the Babylonian empire had passed away, it is not unlikely that he did not always fully understand the manuscripts he was at work upon.

(4) Then in the matter of Belshazzar being represented as King of Babylon. Here the very fact of Daniel's long residence in Babylonia may have led to confusion. In the Babylonian dialect, the words for "king" and "prince" do not seem to have been very clearly distinguished in use, in the days of Daniel; and the fact that the words are used ordinarily in exactly the opposite sense to the corresponding Hebrew words, may account for the independent position assigned to Belshazzar. Professor Sayce writes* as follows concerning an inscription of Cyrus belonging to the period immediately after the conquest of Chaldæa.

"Twice we find *malku*, the Hebrew *melech*, used in the sense of "king" in the place of *sarru*, the Hebrew *sar*. Everywhere else in cuneiform literature *sarru* is the "king," *malku*, the subordinate "prince." It is only here that the Hebrew usage is followed, according to which *melech* was the "king" and *sar* the "prince."

It may be therefore that the word *melech* as applied to Belshazzar ought not to be pressed too closely. Nor is it fair to interpret the language of orientals as we should that of our own country in the nineteenth century. Even if Belshazzar were not actually *de jure* king; if *de facto* he enjoyed regal powers in Babylon, and were the king's son, heir to the throne, and that king far from popular, it is only natural to find super-

* "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 504.

latives used in his regard where we should be content with the positive degree; to find him spoken of, in his own court, and surrounded by his servants and flatterers, as if he were sole and supreme ruler of the empire.

(5) The same confusion between the use of *maliku* and *sarru* may throw light upon the case of Darius the Mede. But Dr. Driver seems to hesitate to pronounce the existence of such a king impossible; in this, following the example of Mr. Pinches. "The circumstances are not perhaps such," writes Dr. Driver (p. 469) "as to be absolutely inconsistent with either the existence or office of "Darius the Mede;" and a cautious criticism will not build too much on the silence of the inscriptions, where many certainly remain yet to be brought to light."

(6) It hardly seems sufficient reason to deny the early date of the Book of Daniel, because the writer says "he" understood by *the books* "(בספרים), the number of years for which, according to Jeremiah, Jerusalem should lie waste."* It may, no doubt, be taken for granted that by the term "the books" used in Daniel, some kind of collection of the writings of the prophets, including Jeremiah, is referred to.† But there seems no reason to suppose that some such collection or collections should not have existed in time for Daniel to have made use of them. The abbé Loisy seems very fairly to outline the history of the collection of the prophetic writings in the following words:‡

Il est tout naturel de penser que les œuvres des prophètes restaient aux mains de leurs disciples, qui les étudiaient et qui nous les ont conservées. Pendant l'exil et après le retour de la captivité, les héritiers de la tradition monothéiste et prophétique réunirent les débris de cette littérature. Les livres d'Isaïe et de Jérémie, que ne semblent pas avoir été compilés par leurs auteurs mêmes, ont dû recevoir à cette époque la forme qu'ils ont maintenant. Alors aussi on fit la collection des petits prophètes.

It would seem in fact that collections of the writings of the prophets remained in the hands of their disciples; doubtless

* Driver, p. 469.

† It is by no means unanimously held that "the books" here refers to a collection of the Prophets. Thus Mr. Bevan thinks "the Pentateuch" is alluded to. P. 149.

‡ "Histoire du Canon de l'Ancien Testament," p. 36.

such collections had great weight, and there was a tendency, from the desire of students to possess copies of the writings of as many of the prophets as possible for their own use, towards the formation of collections of the prophetic writings; a tendency which culminated at a later day, in the Canon of the Prophets. Why may not Daniel have referred to some such collection as one of these? Why should not some such collection have existed in his time?

The above sketch does not pretend to contain a refutation of the many arguments arrayed against the authenticity of the Book of Daniel; arguments which may be acknowledged to be both numerous and weighty. In this paper, indeed, many have not even been mentioned. All that has been attempted is to suggest a way in which the Book of Daniel may have come into existence, without denying the authorship of the prophecies contained in it to Daniel; and to show that, on the theory advocated, many of the arguments usually levelled against the early date of the prophecies of Daniel fall to the ground. One great objection still remains against the authenticity of the book—the fact that, if written in the sixth century B.C., it contains prophecies, in the usual acceptation of the word. The argument supported here postulates the possibility and actual occurrence of prophecy. In Daniel, the state of affairs, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, seems clearly delineated. For one, therefore, who does not believe that the prophets received from God power to foretell future events, the book must belong to the second century B.C. On the other hand, if the power of revealing what is to happen in the future be conceded as one of the prophetic gifts, there are many arguments which go to show that Daniel was really responsible for the prophecies which bear his name.

It must be remembered too, that there are certain words used in the Book of Daniel, at the end of the prophecies, which lend a certain amount of support to the theory advocated above. “But thou, O Daniel,” says the Angel (xii. 4), “shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the appointed time;” words which seem to apply, not merely to the angelic revelation, but to the entire Book of Daniel.* What do these words mean?

* Bevan, p. 202.

Do they not seem to refer to a hiding away of Daniel's prophecies till a later day? Till the "appointed time?" And is it not natural to identify the "appointed time" with the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, to which so many of the prophecies seem to apply—when such a prophecy would have had so powerful an influence—and at which period, so many scholars seem to hold, that Daniel, in its present form, was written?

J. A. HOWLETT.

ART. IV.—ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE great and valuable assistance which the Septuagint has quite recently yielded to the work of removing from our present Hebrew or Massoretic text many of its numerous literary defects, has induced us to devote a few pages to the subject of its origin and history.

The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, the commencement of which may be placed in the middle of the third century B.C., was undertaken for the use and benefit of the Hellenistic Jews, more especially of those in Alexandria and Egypt. Already as early as the beginning of the sixth century B.C., when numerous citizens of the kingdom of Judea were carried away by the Chaldeans to the various provinces of their extensive empire, many Jews left their country to seek a place of refuge and security in Egypt (4 Kings xxv. 26). About two centuries and a half later (331 B.C.), Alexander, being master of the East, laid in Egypt the foundations of a city, which was to be called after him Alexandria. Hither he brought a colony of Jews, assigning to them a certain part of the city for their abode ("Josephus against Apion," ii. 4). In the year 320 B.C., Ptolemy Soter, who, after Alexander's death, had made himself master of Egypt, seized upon Jerusalem, carried away a great number of captives, both Jews and Samaritans, and settled them in Egypt ("Antiquities," xii. 1, § 1), while not a few Jews followed of their own accord, induced by the fertility of the land and the liberality of Ptolemy. Consequently, the colony of Jews in Alexandria, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, Soter's successor, must have been considerable. Josephus, moreover, tells us ("Ant." xii. chap. 2, § 3), that money was given by Philadelphus for the ransom of no less than 100,000 Jewish slaves; and, however exaggerated this statement may be, yet we may conclude from it that the Hebrew colony in Egypt formed at that time a numerous community.

Alexandria was, and during the first succeeding centuries remained, a Greek city. Not only was the city founded by a

Greek-speaking nation, but it soon developed into one of the most important commercial places of the world, at a time when Greek was a language very generally spoken. The successors, moreover, of Ptolemy I. did their best to promote in Alexandria the various branches of culture and intellectual activity; they meant to make their city a centre of Grecian art, literature and science. For this purpose a museum was built, where scholars and men of science found lodging, support, and opportunity for study and instruction. A library also was formed, such as had not been heard of before, and which Livy could rightly name "*Elegantiae regum curaeque egregium opus.*" In short, Alexandria became a second Athens.

Such was the society in which the Jewish settlers found themselves. Yet here, as elsewhere, the Jews preserved their national character, and remained a nation distinct from the people amongst whom they lived. They did not cease to be a Semitic race although they dwelt in the centre of Greek civilisation; nor did they lose their attachment for the religion of their fathers or their zeal for the observance of the law, although, without temple or altar themselves, they were surrounded by the magnificent structures of heathen temples, where they could daily see the rites of pagan worship performed with all possible splendour. Then, as now, the religion of Jehovah was deeply rooted in the heart of the devout Jew, and the law, with its peculiar prescriptions, had drawn so sharp a distinction between Israel and all other nations that amalgamation or absorption was a moral impossibility.

Though deeply cherishing his nationality and his religion, the Jew was not prevented from having intercourse with his neighbours of Alexandria. If we may rely upon the account of Josephus, the Jewish settlers had received from Alexander, and afterwards from Ptolemy Soter and Philadelphus, not only civil freedom, but also privileges almost equal to those of the Macedonians. These advantages placed the Jews on a somewhat equal line with the Greeks; they made it possible for them to improve their condition through commercial enterprise, and consequently brought them into frequent contact with their fellow citizens. Hence the absolute necessity for the Jews to learn the Greek language, and we may safely hold that they

were not slow in adopting it; on the contrary, in the case of many, Greek had, before long, taken the place of their native Aramaic, which, in consequence of disuse, was gradually forgotten.

In proportion as the use of the Greek language increased amongst the Hellenistic Jews, the need of a Greek translation of the Mosaic law made itself felt. Having become strangers with regard to their national language, it was necessary that their sacred books, for which their veneration and love had remained unchanged, should be read to them in the language which they understood. For this purpose the Greek translation, known as the version of the Septuagint, was made.

According to a legend—generally believed as true—in the first centuries after Christ, but now by many rejected as a fable, the version was made by the express wish and order of King Philadelphus. The oldest and more simple form of this legend is known to us from the so-called letter of Aristeas, a person at the court of Philadelphus, written to his brother Polycrates. This letter gives an account of how the translation was made.

Ptolemy Philadelphus, having heard from his librarian, Demetrius Phalerius, concerning the sacred law books of the Hebrews, desired to possess a translation of them that he might place it in his library at Alexandria. In order to secure for this work the goodwill and co-operation of the Jews in Palestine, Ptolemy set about procuring the liberty of those of their countrymen in Egypt who still were in slavery. He then sent ambassadors to the high-priest Eleazar in Jerusalem, who thankfully received the costly presents made to him by the king, and in return sent seventy-two of the learned men amongst the Jews, six of every tribe, that they might make the translation the king desired. They were received in Egypt with great distinction, and after some time accomplished their work, which gave great satisfaction to their countrymen, and which met with the full approval of the king, from whom they departed with many presents to return to their own country.

This anecdote already accepted by Philo ("De Vita Moysis," lib. ii.), and by Josephus, ("Ant." xii. 2), found much credit amongst the earlier Fathers, who even adorned it with additions. St. Justin the Martyr, for instance, informs us that the seventy

translators lived and worked in so many separate cells, without any communication, and that, notwithstanding this strict seclusion, their versions were found to agree, not merely as to the correctness wherewith they had rendered the meaning of the original, but even to the very words, even to the minutest particulars, which circumstance so greatly astounded the King that he attributed it to a special divine assistance. Justin, moreover, for fear that the Greeks should think this account fictitious, asserted that he had seen the ruins of these cells in the island of Pharos. (*"Justinus Cohortatio ad Graecos,"* c. 13). A similar account is given by Irenaeus and Clemens Alexandrinus, who appear to have had no difficulty in admitting it because of the still greater miracle which had happened when Esdras, assisted by special inspiration, rewrote from memory all the sacred books which had perished by fire. (*"Iren."* iii., 21 *Clem. Alex. "Strom."* i. p. 342). St. Jerome, on the other hand, adhering to the epistle of Aristeas, strongly repudiated this later version of the story. *"Nescio quis primus auctor septuaginta cellulas Alexandriae medacio suo extruxerit."* (St. Jerome, *"Prol. in Pentat."*).

The legend, both in its more original and later form, was evidently invented to raise the authority of the Greek translation. Hitzig has put forth the supposition, that the Greek version was originally called the *"Version of the Seventy,"* not because it was made by seventy-two translators, but because it was approved of by the seventy members of the Alexandrine Synedrium, and that its name subsequently gave rise to the wonderful fable concerning its origin. (*"Gesch. der Volkes Israel,"* 341). Whether this supposition is plausible or not, we cannot decide, but, in any case, the legend on the whole appears to deserve no credit, except in so far as it assigns the translation to the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who perhaps might have shown some interest in the work.

The letter of Aristeas is by all acknowledged to be a forgery composed perhaps in the first century before Christ, by a Hellenistic Jew. Its Greek is barbarous, full of Hebrew expressions, and its sentiments are distinctly Jewish. Independently of the letter of Aristeas, an appeal is sometimes made to the testimony of Aristobolus by those who still wish to uphold as trustworthy the story of the seventy-two translators.

From the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius we know that Aristobolus was a Jewish philosopher who lived at Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, (170–150 B.C.). He is probably the same person who is mentioned in the second book of the Macchabees (i. 10) as having been the preceptor of the king. A work is attributed to him named “An explanation of the Law of Moses,” which he is said to have dedicated to the King, and of which, certain fragments have been preserved by Clemens and Eusebius. Judging from the contents of these fragments, Aristobolus’ work seems to have been not so much a commentary on the Sacred Text as a free reproduction of the history of the Pentateuch for the purpose of showing to the cultured heathen world that the Mosaic law, when rightly understood, contained all that the best Greek philosophers had taught. His chief object therefore was, as Clemens tells us, “To show that the Peripatetic philosophy was dependent on the law of Moses and the writings of the other prophets” (“Strom.” v. 595).

In a passage of this work quoted by Clemens, (“Strom.” i. 22) and Eusebius, (“Praep. Evang.” xiii. 12), Aristobolus informs us that part of the Pentateuch had already been translated before the conquest of Alexander and the Persians, so that even Plato had known the Jewish law and had borrowed from it, but that the entire translation of Israel’s code was accomplished under Philadelphus.

For before Demetrius Phalerius, even before the conquests of Alexander and the Persians, a translation was made by others narrating the Exodus of the Hebrews, our countrymen, from Egypt, and all the events that had happened to them, and the occupation of the land and the explanation of the entire law; so that it is manifest that the aforesaid philosopher (Plato) has borrowed much from them. . . . But the translation of the entire law took place under the king called Philadelphus, thy forefather, because of the great interest and zealous endeavours of Demetrius Phalerius.

The authenticity of the writings of Aristobolus has been disputed by several modern scholars, (Eichhorn, Kuenen, Grätz and Joël). It appears to them improbable that Aristobolus held the absurd opinion that philosophers such as Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and poets such as Homer and Hesiod, had borrowed from the doctrine and writings of Moses. They

point out how unlikely it is that Aristobolus, in a work dedicated to the king, should have quoted, as verses of Orpheus, Hesiod and Homer, that which is beyond question the work of some Hellenistic Jew. If, on the whole, the authenticity of Aristobolus' works is doubtful, the passage giving account of how the translation of the Septuagint was made is yet more so for the following reasons. It is in the first place strange that Aristobolus, while designating the Hebrews as "our countrymen," speaks of "the land" (Palestine) without mentioning its name. Can we suppose that Aristobolus would have written in this manner to the King of Egypt, who no doubt knew that the Hebrews were Aristobolus' countrymen, but for whom it was certainly not superfluous to mention the name of Palestine, a country to him of comparatively little importance? It is, moreover, extremely improbable that Demetrius ever had been librarian at the Court of King Philadelphus. On the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that Demetrius was exiled by Philadelphus immediately after this king's accession to the throne, and that he shortly afterwards died. Can we admit that Aristobolus, in a writing addressed to the king, should have committed such a great historical error? Does it not appear to be more probable that the passage in question, like the rest of the work from which it is taken, is falsely attributed to the philosopher Aristobolus by one of the ἀλάζονες Ἰουδαῖοι who, with the authority of Aristobolus, wished to corroborate the idea, not a little flattering to the Jews, that the Greek writers of antiquity had been dependent on their sacred books, and that their Greek version of the bible owed its origin to the special interest which King Philadelphus had shown in their literature.

As the need of a translation of the bible was not restricted to the Pentateuch, a Greek version first of the prophetic books, and subsequently of the Hagiographa also, soon made its appearance. Neither the time when the various books were translated nor the names of the translators are known. As some of the Hagiographa, for instance, Daniel, and certain psalms, were not written before the Machabean age, the Greek translation of the entire Hebrew bible cannot have been finished before the middle of the second century B.C. On the other hand, it is certain that towards the end of the same cen-

tury, a Greek version of most of the Hebrew books existed, for the translator of Ecclesiasticus mentions in his prologue, that on his arrival in Egypt (132 B.C.), he found a translation of the Law, the Prophets, and Hagiographa. "And not only these, but also the law itself, and the prophets and the rest of the books, (Hagiographa), have no small difference when they are read in their own language;" (prol. to Eccli.). It is, therefore, very probable that the version of the Septuagint was finished about the commencement of the first century B.C. The opinion of Dr. Grätz that the translation of Ecclesiastes is the work of Aquila does not find much favour amongst critics.

The Greek of the Septuagint is the so-called "Dialectus Communis," which, after the age of Alexander, was more generally used. Hebrew and Aramaic expressions are naturally of frequent occurrence, for, as the Greek language possesses no adequate words to express certain Hebrew ideas, a meaning is sometimes given to Greek words (for instance, *δόξα, εἰρήνη*) which they did not possess before.

Since the Septuagint is the work of more than one translator, there is naturally much difference in the translation of its separate books. It is evident that the translators were not all equally capable, and that they were unequally versed in the knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. It is generally held that the translation of the Pentateuch is both as regards fidelity of rendering and correctness of language superior to that of the other books. Jerome says of it: "Quem nos quoque profite-mur plus quam cæteros consonare cum hebraeis exemplaribus." The translation of the other historic books may be said to hold the second place. A very inferior translation is that of Ecclesiastes. The translator of this book seems not always to have understood his original, with the consequence that he has sometimes obscured the meaning of passages which in the Hebrew text are comparatively clear. On the whole, he aimed at a very literal translation by substituting for every Hebrew word a Greek word, forgetful that the Greek construction often renders Hebrew prepositions superfluous. For instance, he repeatedly renders the Hebrew *Nota accusativi* "*eth*" with *σύν*. *Ex. gr.* Eccl. ii. 17: "*καὶ ἐμίσησα σύν τὴν ζωὴν*" = "So I hated life." As regards the Greek translation of the books of Esther and Daniel, it appears that the translator has performed

his work in a very free and independent manner, or else that others have made in his translation the many changes, additions, and omissions by which the original account is not a little changed.

The use of the Septuagint did not remain restricted to the Jewish colony in Alexandria and Egypt, but soon extended itself to the Hebrew settlements in Asia and Europe. Even in Palestine the Septuagint was known, and although it was not publicly read in the Synagogues, it was, at least by some, privately used and studied. Flavius Josephus, a Palestinian Jew, frequently quotes and follows it. The Hebrew Bible, however, always remained the official text in Palestine, and consequently the Septuagint was the bible of the Jews of the Diaspora, and as such became a means in the hands of Providence to spread the knowledge of the true God amongst the heathen, and so to prepare the way for the religion of Christ.

From the Jews the Septuagint passed into the hands of the Christians. The Christian religion, less successful in Palestine, found a more ready acceptance amongst the heathens and Jewish settlers in foreign countries, and, owing to the work of St. Paul, made vast and rapid conquests amongst them. The newly converted Christians naturally adopted the Septuagint, which alone they could understand, and with which such amongst them as were either Jews or proselytes were already acquainted. This circumstance well explains why the writers of the New Testament use by preference the Septuagint when quoting passages from the Old Testament books. They accommodated themselves in this to their Christians, to whom the Hebrew text was unknown.

After the time of the Apostles the Septuagint version remained the standard text amongst the Christians until the time of St. Jerome. The apostolic and apologetic "Fathers" constantly used it, and, if we except Origen, hardly ever doubted its correctness. In their judgment the Septuagint possessed an authority equal to that of the Hebrew text, for, as we have already pointed out, some of them held that the Septuagint was translated with the special assistance of the Holy Ghost. It is not astonishing, therefore, that Justin and Irenaeus should have defended the Septuagint rendering "Behold *the virgin* (*παρθένος* = *virgo*) shall conceive and bring forth a son," of the prophecy of Isaia, vii. 14, against

the translation of Aquila and Theodotion, "Behold the *maiden* (*νεανίς* = adolescentula) shall conceive and bring forth a son."*

In proportion as the Septuagint became more and more the bible of the Christians, it ceased to be the bible of the Jews. The constant use which the Christians made of it in their encounters with the Jews, could not but make the latter averse to its authority. Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, clearly shows how in his time the Jews already distrusted and hated it.

But I do not approve of your teachers, who will not consent that the seventy ancients by Ptolemy, the king of the Egyptians, have given a correct translation, but who themselves undertook to make a translation. Nor do I wish you to be ignorant that they have suppressed from the translation, made by the ancients who were with Ptolemy, a part of the scriptures from which it can be clearly proved that He who was crucified had been foretold as God and man, as crucified and dying.†

This growing diffidence and aversion amongst the Jews as regards the Septuagint explains why in Talmudic legends the day of its translation is considered an evil day. Of the fast on the 8th day of Tebeth it is said, "because on that day the Law was written in Greek under King Ptolemy, and darkness came over the earth." (Megillath-Ta'anith, f. 50, c. 2). And in Tract. Sopher, the day, "on which the five ancients wrote the law in Greek," is called, "an evil day for Israel, a day like the day on which the golden calf was made."

Since the Septuagint had become the bible of the Christians, a new translation of the Hebrew scriptures was needed for the use of the Hellenistic Jews. This translation was first made by Aquila, according to Irenaeus who first makes mention of him, a Jewish proselyte from Pontus. The Jerusalem Talmud, ("Megilla," i., 11, f. 71^c), says of him: "Aquila the proselyte translated the Thorah in the time of R. Eliezer and R. Josua; they praised him and said to him, 'Thou art the most beautiful amongst the children of men.' (Ps. 45)." The account which Epiphanius gives of Aquila deserves little credit. According to him Aquila was a relative of the Emperor Hadrian, and a convert to the Christian faith, but, because of his liking for astrology, he was expelled from the Christian community and

* "Iren." iii., c. 21; St. Just. "Dial. cum Tryph.," § 71.

† "Dial. cum Tryph.," § 71; compare §§ 79 and 84.

became a Jew. It perhaps may be true that Aquila lived under the reign of Hadrian, in the beginning of the second century.

Aquila's translation aims at a most close and minute conformity with the Hebrew text, with the consequence that he changed the meaning of a great many words, and translated Hebrew prepositions which the Greek does not admit. Jerome ridicules this exactness in the following words :

Eruditissimus linguae Hebraicae, non solum verba sed etymologias verborum quoque transferre conatus est, jure projicitur a nobis. Quis enim pro *frumento* et *vino* et *oleo* posset legere vel intelligere χεῖμα, ὀπωρισμὸν, σπιλπότητα, quod nos possumus dicere *fusionem*, *pomationem* et *splendentiam* ? *

Yet, it was no doubt because of this close conformity with the original that Aquila succeeded in obtaining for his work the approval of the great Rabbinical authorities, and that his version soon took the place of the Septuagint amongst the Hellenistic Jews.

Aquila's version, as a whole, perished when the Hellenistic Jews ceased to form a distinct party ; but fragments of it have come down to us through the quotations of Jerome and Eusebius and from the "Hexapla" of Origen.

Two other private translations, that of Theodotion and that of Symmachus, deserve to be mentioned. Theodotion was, according to Irenaeus, (iii. 21), a proselyte from Ephesus, while Jerome informs us that some held him to be an Ebionite. "Licet eum quidam dicunt Hebionitam, qui altero genere Judaicus est." † His translation is not much more than a correction of the Septuagint. His version of Daniel, as Jerome tells us, was used by the Christians instead of the Septuagint, and from it the Deutero-canonical parts of that book in the Vulgata have been translated. ‡

Symmachus, of whom Irenaeus makes no mention, was, according to Jerome and Eusebius, an Ebionite. His version appears to have distinguished itself from that of Aquila and Theodotion by greater purity of Greek and freer method of

* In Isai. xlix.

† "Præf. in Dan."

‡ Jerome, "Præf. in Dan."

rendering. "Non solet verborum *κακοζηλίαν*, sed intelligentiæ ordinem sequi." *

The rapid progress of the Christian religion amongst the many nations of the Roman Empire made it necessary that the Septuagint should be translated into various languages, and consequently, being itself a version, it became in its turn the parent of many others. The principal versions are the old Latin versions used in Africa and Italy, dating from the earliest ages of Christianity; a Syriac version, made in the year 617 by Paul Bishop of Tela, on the advice of Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria; an Ethiopian version of the fourth century; and two Egyptian versions, one in the dialect of lower Egypt (Memphitic), the other in that of upper Egypt (Thebaic), both probably dating from the fourth or third century. Further, an Armenian version, probably of the fifth century; a Slavonic version of the ninth century, usually assigned to Methodius and Cyrillus; and lastly, some Arabic translations of the prophets, psalms, and books of Solomon (10–12 cent.).

In course of time the Septuagint lost, through frequent transcription, much of its original purity, for not only mechanical mistakes crept into the text through the carelessness of the "*librarii dormientes*," but bolder transcribers changed, added, or omitted, words and clauses. "Now it is manifest," says Origen, "that the difference of copies has become great, either because of the thoughtlessness of some of the scribes, or through the unpardonable boldness of others when correcting the Scriptures, or because some while correcting added or omitted what they thought right." †

For the purpose of purifying the Septuagint from these imperfections, Origen, the great Alexandrine scholar, undertook to revise it according to the Hebrew text and other Greek versions. To this work he was prompted also by a polemical object, wishing to give the Christians a text on which they could safely rely in their controversies with the Jews, lest, as he expresses it, "while arguing against the Jews, we might bring forward what does not exist in their copies." ‡ This plan he carried out in his famous work the "Hexapla," in which

* Jerome, "Comm. in Amos" iii

† Orig. "Comm. in Matth."

‡ "Epist. ad Afric."

he placed in six parallel columns—(1) The Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; (2) The same in Greek characters; (3) The version of Aquila; (4) That of Symmachus; (5) Of the Septuagint; (6) Of Theodotion; to which in another edition he added the three unknown translations called “Quinta,” “Sexta” and “Septima.”* He then corrected the Septuagint by comparing it with the Hebrew text and with the other Greek versions, especially with that of Theodotion, marking with an asterisk (*) whatever he inserted from those sources into the text, and placing an obelus (—) wherever the Septuagint contained anything that was wanting in them.

Origen, no doubt, succeeded to a great extent in freeing the Septuagint of many of the errors which in course of time had found their way into it. His “Hexapla” is really the first critical revision of the Greek text, and as such deserves the highest praise. Yet the great object which Origen had in view, that of restoring the original Greek translation, was not obtained. Nor is this to be wondered at. The canon by which Origen was guided was not entirely trustworthy. He worked on the supposition that the original Septuagint text was that which most closely resembled the Hebrew or the translations substantially based upon it. Yet this correctness and superiority of the Hebrew text, assumed by Origen, and after him to a still greater extent by Jerome, is far from being true. It is now a well-established principle amongst all critics that our present Hebrew text, which differs but slightly from that which Jerome and Origen knew, is frequently corrupt, and that in many instances where the Hebrew text and Septuagint differ, the former must be corrected according to the latter. By taking the Hebrew text as his standard Origen had gone a step in the wrong direction. A second defect of Origen’s revision is that the system he adopted was not well suited to safeguard the purity of the text. The signs by which he indicated additions and omissions were apt to be neglected in transcriptions, so that the “Hexapla” from its very nature led to the formation of mixed texts, containing side by side the genuine Septuagint version with corrections introduced from Theodotion.

* Jerome, “Comm. in Tit.” iii.

In his preface to "Paralipomenon," Jerome speaks of two other recensions of the Septuagint, viz., that of Hesychius and Lucian.

Alexandriae et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam, Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt quos ab Origine elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt, totusque orbis hac inter et trifaria varietate compugnat.

Of Hesychius and his recension little is known. Lucian was a priest of the Church of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia 312 A.D. According to a passage of Suidas he prepared his revised edition with the greatest care, diligently comparing it with the Hebrew.

About forty years ago critics discovered that Lucian's recension was not lost, but has been preserved in the four cursive MSS. 19, 82, 93, 108. To this conclusion they were led by the following course of events. They first noticed that these four codices embodied readings different not merely from those of other MSS., but even from those of the Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Dr. Ceriani next advanced the supposition that this peculiar text might contain Lucian's recension. This supposition was confirmed by Dr. Lagarde, who pointed out how several of the characteristic readings of this text coincided with citations of St. Chrysostom, who as a priest of Antioch and bishop of Constantinople would, in accordance with Jerome's statement, have used Lucian's recension.

Lucian's recension has of late contributed most considerable assistance to the work both of recovering the genuine Septuagint and of reconstructing some of the many corrupt passages in the Massoretic text. As we have already indicated, Lucian, like Origen, was guided in his work of revising by the current Hebrew text. Yet there is this difference between the two recensions that while Origen had, to use Jerome's words, the "audacity" to insert from Theodotion's version whatever was missing, Lucian appears to have directed his attention to improve the literary form of the Septuagint, by substituting for certain words synonyms which better pleased him. For instance, *παρεγέτο* for *ἦλθεν*; *ἐπολέμησε* for *παρετάζατο*; *τὸ ἀρεστὸν* for *τὸ ἀγαθόν*. In those instances where a Greek and Hebrew reading varied, he used to place beside the normal

Greek rendering a rendering more closely expressing the Hebrew variant. Hence those conflate readings so characteristic in Lucian's recension. For instance 1 Kings xiv. 40. "And he said to all Israel: Be ye on one side, and I and Jonathan will be on the other side. And the people said to Saul: Do what appeareth good in thine eyes." In this passage Lucian's recension gives besides the mistranslation of the Septuagint a correct rendering of the Hebrew. (LXX.) "And Saul said to all the men of Israel: Be ye unto bondage, and I and Jonathan will be unto bondage. And the people said to Saul: Do what appeareth good in thine eyes." (Luc.) "And Saul said to the people: Be ye on one side and I and Jonathan will be on the other side."

In addition to this, there is the remarkable fact that Lucian's recension contains renderings which are not found in other MSS. of the Septuagint, and which presuppose corresponding readings in Hebrew, greatly superior to those of our Massoretic text. Whether these readings were taken by Lucian from old and valuable MSS. of the Septuagint, of which all traces have disappeared, or whether he has translated them from a special Hebrew MS. which had in those passages preserved the genuine reading, is a question of minor importance. The great value and importance of Lucian's recension is that it points to a Hebrew source, in many places superior to the Massoretic text, and consequently that it helps critics to restore the true reading of many a corrupt place of our Hebrew bible. Two or three examples may serve to illustrate what we have said.

4 Kings xv. 10.—"And Shallum, the son of Jabesh, conspired against him and smote him *kabal-âm*, and killed him and reigned in his stead." The words *kabal-âm*, an un-Hebraic expression, are usually made to mean "before the people." Jerome rendered "publicly"; the Septuagint left the word untranslated. Lucian's recension reads ἐν Ιεβλααμ = "in *Jeblaam*," which no doubt is the true reading, for *Jeblaam* is a city in the tribe of Manasseh. (Jos. xvii. 11; Judg. i. 27; 1 Kings ix. 27).

1 Kings xii. 11.—"And the Lord sent Jerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and *Samuel*, and delivered you from the hand of your enemies round about." The improbability of this read-

ing—with which the Septuagint agrees—viz., that Samuel in his discourse to the people should have used his own name, disappears in Lucian's text, where instead of Samuel we have *Samson*.

1 Kings xiii. 5.—“And the Philistines assembled themselves to fight with Israel, *thirty thousand* chariots, and six thousand horsemen, and people as the sand which is on the sea-shore in multitude.” The number of chariots, given also by the Septuagint and Vulgata, is evidently an error of transcription, as it is in no proportion to the number of horsemen. Lucian's recension, in which the number is *three* thousand, is no doubt the genuine reading.

1 Kings xiii. 7.—“Now (some of) the Hebrews had passed over the Jordan to the land of Gad and Gilead, but as for Saul he was yet in Gilgal, and all the people *went after* him trembling.” The last clause of this sentence, which is substantially the same in the Septuagint and Vulgata, does not well fit in with the context. Lucian's recension reads ἀποῦπισθεν αὐτοῦ = “*trembled from after him*,” or “*forsook him trembling*.” This reading well agrees with the following verse: “And he waited seven days according to the set time that Samuel had fixed; but Samuel came not to Gilgal, and the people were scattered from him.”

As a proof that in the work of recovering the true Septuagint text great results have already been obtained, we have but to mention the new Cambridge edition of the Septuagint by Dr. Swete, which follows the text of the Vatican codex, having the variants of the Sinaitic codex and of four other uncial MSS. in the margin; as also Dr. Lagarde's work “*Librorum Veteris Testamenti canon*,” containing Lucian's recension. In like manner much has been done for the correction of the Hebrew text by various scholars, whose works no doubt have prepared the way for the new and revised edition, which is now gradually appearing. This revision, the work of eminent scholars in Europe and America promises, if we may judge by the books that have already appeared (Job, Samuel, and Leviticus), to become a standard work of textual criticism.

It deserves, moreover, to be noticed that correctness of text, even when approximately attained, is a great help for the understanding of the Scriptures. Before finishing, therefore,

this article, we should like to give still one example which may show that textual criticism is a work not merely of philological interest, but of great value also for the exegetical study of the bible.

In 1 Kings vi. 19, we read "And He smote of the men of Bethsamer, because they had seen the ark of Jehovah, seventy and fifty thousand men. And the people mourned, because the Lord had smitten them with a great slaughter." Now according to this reading it is difficult to explain what sin really the unhappy Bethsamites had committed, that Jehovah should have punished them so severely. This difficulty for a great part is cleared up by the following correction suggested by Josephus and the Septuagint. "Now the sons of Jechoniah did not rejoice with the men of Bethsamer when they saw the ark of Jehovah. And He smote of them seventy men. And the people mourned because Jehovah had smitten the people with a great slaughter." Here we have in the first place the incredible number seventy and fifty thousand reduced to seventy, and the reason of the punishment is stated, as the children of Jechoniah had refused to rejoice, perhaps also to share in the sacrificial feast (Conf. v. v. 13-14), with the other people of Bethsames.

C. VAN DEN BIESEN.

ART. V.—THE MEDIÆVAL SERVICE-BOOKS OF AQUITAINE.

II. AUCH.

THE Archbishop of Auch had formerly primatial jurisdiction over ten dioceses—viz., Bazas, Dax, Lescar, Oleron, St. Bertrand des Comminges, Lectoure, St. Lizier, Aire, Bayonne, and Tarbes.

The Revolution drove into exile the bishops of France, and it was impossible for many of them to return to their dioceses after the restoration of Catholic worship, as these had been obliterated from the ecclesiastical map sanctioned by the Concordat of 1801. The ancient boundaries of the various sees were completely ignored at this date, and the dioceses then reconstituted were made to correspond with the limits of the departments into which the country had been divided; but, as the number of re-established bishops was less than the number of departments, many of the new dioceses contained several of the civil divisions.

Auch lost its metropolitan rank, and the department of Gers, composed of no less than seven fragments of ancient dioceses, was annexed to the bishopric of Agen.

Only one suffragan See of the whole province of Auch survived, and this diocese (Bayonne) included the three large departments of the Landes and the Basses and Hautes Pyrénées, which with the department of Gers form, at the present day, the modern province of Auch. The metropolitan See was restored to existence by the Concordat of 1822, which divided the overgrown modern diocese of Bayonne among two other suffragan bishoprics—Aire and Tarbes—and assigned the department of Gers as the diocese of the archbishop.

Gers was carved out of the old dioceses of Auch, Toulouse, Lombez, Lectoure, Aire, Tarbes, and Condom, while other portions of the old suffragan dioceses of Auch were annexed to the metropolitan jurisdiction of Toulouse.

In 1822, there were in use in the new archdiocese no less than six different Liturgies and Breviaries, and at least two

Rituals, serving for the celebration of Mass, the recitation of the hours, and the administration of the sacraments. This state of confusion lasted till 1838, when new provincial service-books were published by the archbishop—the new Breviary in 1826, the Missal in 1836, and the Ritual in 1838—but these appeared without the authority of Rome despite all attempts to obtain such approval. These service-books remained in use throughout the archdiocese till 1857, when a strong desire was expressed at the Synod then held at Auch, to return to unity of worship and revive the use of the Roman Liturgy, retaining at the same time a Proper of Saints for the See. This supplement to the Missal and Breviary, sanctioned by Pius IX., was adopted with the Roman Use in 1858; and was revised and approved by the Congregation of Rites in 1890 for use in the whole province.

It would be out of place in this article to enter into details of the service-books imposed on their respective dioceses by the French prelates of the eighteenth century. Particulars of them as regards this province are given by the learned archivist of the Grand Seminary of Auch in his pamphlet (the forerunner of a greater work) on its Liturgy.* Our intention is rather to enter into details concerning the ancient Missals and Breviaries which have survived the general wreck of Huguenot and Revolutionary devastation.

During the wars of the sixteenth century the Huguenot leader Montgomery carried destruction and ruin throughout Gascony, which fell a special victim to his devastations. The cathedral of Tarbes with its archives was burnt, and the destruction of ecclesiastical furniture, vestments, and books was general throughout the country.† In the libraries of its cities and seminaries there is not a single Missal in MS. to be found at the present day! Of the mediæval Roman-French liturgies of its various dioceses few examples are in existence, and these are early printed copies.

When the libraries of the cathedrals and religious houses were confiscated by the State in 1790, numerous valuable books and manuscripts disappeared through the carelessness,

* "*Liturgie de la Province d'Auch*," par l'Abbé Cazauran, 1891.

† Martene, "*Voyage Littéraire*," 1717.

or cupidity, of the persons entrusted with the task of transferring them to the municipal libraries. Many of these, however, possess rich collections of mediæval service-books, but this corner of France is unhappily remarkable for its lack of such interesting treasures, and this fact points to their wanton destruction at an earlier period.

Taking into consideration the jurisdiction exercised by the Primate of Novempopulania, during the middle ages, over "Navarre beyond the mountains," it is possible that a search among the shelves of monastic and other libraries in the North of Spain might lead to the discovery of some examples of the liturgies at present missing. It is known that the Lescar Missal was printed at Pampeluna in Navarre, and it is probable that the neighbouring dioceses may have obtained their service-books from the same press. Printing-presses do not appear to have been set up in the South of France till some years after the art of printing was known and practised in other places.

There are no MS. breviaries of the diocese of Auch in existence now, but Canon d'Aignan du Sendat (ob. 1764) saw one in his day, as he transcribed from its calendar the names of the local saints whose feasts were observed.* From his notes it is evident that the old Breviary of Auch contained the offices of all the saints whose bodies reposed in the diocese.

Among the archives of the Grand Seminary at Auch are two Books of Hours in MS., one of which is beautifully illuminated on vellum (end of fourteenth century). Four Books of Hours (fifteenth century) are also preserved in the Municipal Library, which also contains a copy of the Breviary printed in 1533. This, however, was not the first printed Breviary of the archdiocese, as one reads at the end that it is a new edition, "*novo typo excussum*," and Mgr. Montillet, in an *Ordonnance* dated 1752, refers to ancient breviaries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, of which divers copies existed at that date.

The Grand Seminary also possesses copies of two valuable incunables—the Missals of 1491 (in fo.) and of 1495 (in 4to).

From the colophon of the Auch Missal of 1491, we learn that it was printed at the expense of Hugh de Cos, a merchant

* Bib. de la Ville d'Auch, MSS. 72, 83.

at Toulouse. Liber missalis ad usū ecclesie metropolitane Ste marie auxis ductu et impensa nobil' viri Hugonis de Cossio mercatoris Tholosani. Impressus ad laudem dei ejusdemqz intemerate virginis marie felici sydere explicit anno dni m.cccc.xci. die v'o xiiij mensis aprilis. *Title*—Ad usum ecclesie auxitane missale feliciter incipit. Small folio, gothic, red rubrics, two col., contains two woodcuts of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, initialed I.D. Hugh de Cos became in 1504 "capitoul" of Toulouse, and though the work of printing this book was under his patronage, it does not seem to have been carried out in that city. The water-mark on the paper is a crowned serpent (à l'aigrette), and is the same mark as that on the Cicero printed at Lyons in 1492, "per Joannem de Prato," so we may safely conclude that this missal came from the same press. This is the more curious as a printing-press already existed in Toulouse, where the beautiful incunable missal of that diocese was first printed in 1490, by Stephen Klebat, the unique copy of which is in the Great Seminary there, though the second edition was printed at Lyons in 1524, and the third and fourth at Paris in 1540 and 1552.

The Auch Missal of 1495 was printed at Pavia, and is a reproduction, as far as the text is concerned, of the missal of 1491. *Title*—Missale secundum ecclesiam auxitanam. *Colophon*—Papie per Franciscum Girardengum M.CCCC.XCV. The Municipal Library of Tarbes also possesses a perfect example of this edition.

The ancient sacramentary, examined by Dom Martene and Dom Durand, in the priory of St. Orens at Auch, has disappeared.*

Judging from the extracts they give, it was probably a MS. of the early part of the twelfth century—"d'environ six cens ans" is rather vague—but the prayers after the Agnus Dei point to that date, as they are not found in a sacramentary at Albi, which is of an earlier period, 950-1025. Canon d'Aignan du Sendat in the copious notes he took of the contents of an ancient sacramentary,† assigns its date to the tenth century, but whether this MS. belonged to the cathedral, or to the

* "Voyage Littéraire" (1717), ii. 28.

† Bib. de la Ville, MS. 72.

priory of St. Orens, seems uncertain. Taking into consideration the pillage and havoc wrought in the cathedral in 1171 by the Comte d'Armagnac and his son, who favoured the Albigensian heretics, and its utter destruction, together with the cloister and residences of the canons, by fire shortly afterwards, it would seem more probable that the MS. from which the Canon made extracts, was the property of the priory, and the one described by Dom Martene. He has copied the Ordinary of the Mass, which begins with the prayer of St. Ambrose, fifty-five proper prefaces, together with the pontifical benedictions and collects, said by the archbishop before the "*Pax Domini*," when celebrating Mass. The saints commemorated, according to ancient use, were chiefly martyrs. There were in it very few feasts of confessors, and these mostly confessors of Gaul—St. Gerald of Aurillac (ob. 920) being the latest in date.

After the Pavia edition of 1495 the next printed copy of the Auch Missal came from the press at Toulouse in 1555. Extracts from it are transcribed in the Canon's MS. 72. The following are of interest: On Maundy Thursday the congregation is to be called together by sound of a trumpet—*hora nona*—and Prime is said. The people are then summoned by the ringing of the great bell, and the canons proceed to the place where the bread is to be blessed. After the "*Mandatum*," a loaf and vegetables are given to each poor person whose feet have been washed. On returning to the church, the celebrant (*hebdomodarius*), vested in a cope, preceded by the cross-bearer and acolytes and accompanied by the deacon, who carries a staff about which is entwined the figure of a serpent holding in its mouth an unlighted candle, proceeds to bless the new fire.

Canon d'Aignan du Sendat adds a note that the practice observed at Auch, of elevating the host during the Pater-noster on Good Friday, is observed daily in the Church of Lyons. On Holy Saturday the deacon is directed to bless the incense, during the Exultet, just before affixing the grains to the Paschal candle. On St. Blaise's day the apple-trees are blessed; and on the feast of St. Agatha loaves of bread. In the Mass for the dead are two proses: the *Dies Iræ*, and the *De profundis exclamantes audi Christe nostras voces in celestia curia*.

From the "Livre Jaune" of the chapter of Tarbes, now among the archives of the department, we learn that the Breviary of that diocese was printed in 1519, and that the sum of 42 "livres tournois" was paid for that purpose to Arnaud Guillem de Bon, the son-in-law of Jean Garlins, printer at Toulouse.

The municipal library of Tarbes contains a mutilated early fifteenth century example in MS. of the Breviary of Tarbes (8vo, 2 cols.). The pages at the beginning and end are missing. It commences with the office of the Third Sunday in Advent, and the calendar follows the Psalter and precedes the Proper of Saints. On page 234, is a title—"Incipit officium feriale beate Marie virginis secundum usum ecclesie Tarvien."

It was inscribed in the catalogue, without any reason in 1746, "*Breviarium ad usum Capucinatorum conventus Tarbiae.*"

A breviary of the diocese of Oleron was printed at Lyons in 1525, by order of the bishop—Jacques de Foix—but no example of it is known to exist. The diocese of Bazas published its breviary in 1530. A copy is in the municipal library of Bordeaux. A copy of the breviary of Lescar, printed in 1541, is in the diocesan library at Auch. It has been reproduced, and ably edited, by the Abbé Dubarat of Pau (1891). Its use in the diocese of Lescar was abandoned in 1635. The Missal of Lescar was printed at Pampeluna in Navarre, in the year 1496. No copy of it can be found in France.

In the Great Seminary at Aire is a breviary of the diocese of Dax, fourteenth century, and another copy is in the municipal library at Toulouse. The latter is a MS. on vellum of the fourteenth century, and contains, on the folio preceding the calendar, a table of the signs of the zodiac with their qualities and complexions, and advice as to the benefit of taking medicine and being bled during each month. There are in it nine great anthems beginning with O for the latter days of Advent, in addition to two others—O Thoma and O decus—for the feast St. Thomas. On Christmas Day, after the ninth response at Matins, is sung the Gospel—*Liber generationis*, &c., according to St. Matthew, and during the Te Deum all the bells are directed to be rung; and the Priest, vested for Mass, is to sing

the introit—*Puer natus est nobis*, with *Deus in adjutorium*, &c., and the *Gloria Patri*; after which the first Mass begins.

No examples in MS. of the Missal and Breviary of the diocese of Bayonne are known to be in existence. A printed copy of the "*Missale ad usum ecclesie Baionensis*," of the year 1543, is in the Bibliothèque Mazarine at Paris. This copy is unique. It is entered in Mr. Weale's valuable catalogue* under the heading of Bayeux in Normandy; the learned author having been misled by the curious misprint of a "c" for an "n" in the title of this edition. In the municipal library of Bayonne the only service-book in MS. is a Graduale of the fifteenth century. On folio xxiii r. is a farsed *Agnus Dei* for feasts of the Blessed Virgin:—

Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi,
Gloriosa spes reorum virgo mores instrue
O Maria fons ortorum jugi stillans diflue.
Miserere nobis.

Agnus Dei, &c.
Super choros angelorum assumpta es Maria
Et a Christo collocata fuisti alta sede.
Miserere nobis.

Agnus Dei, &c.
Virgo dulcis aure pia preces nostras suscipe
Ut possimus sine fine tecum requiescere.
Dona nobis pacem.

This trope of the *Agnus Dei* also appears with neumes in the MS. Missal of Marciac, whence it has been taken and printed in modern notation, by Mons. A. Kunc, choirmaster and organist of the Cathedral, Toulouse.

The Archbishop of Auch—Philippe de Levis (1425–1453)—published some statutes regulating the services in his cathedral. Matins were to be said three or four hours after midnight according to the season of the year, followed by a Mass at sunrise said by the prebendary of the week. Some hours later the Canon-Sacristan is ordered to ring for High Mass on four or eight bells according to the solemnity of the feast of the day:—"quod dictae campanae cum bona melodia et concordia pulsantur." The high mass being ended, the celebrant, together

* "*Catalogus Missalium ritus latini*," 1886.

with the deacon and sub-deacon, are to lead into the cloister and conduct to table the "eight poor of Christ" to dine there according to custom—from the year 1500, the number of these poor people was raised to thirteen. It is laid on their conscience to see that the Cellarer does his duty to these humble guests. This office of blessing the dinner for the poor was founded in 1175, by Canon Hérard Dupin, and was called "Le Mandat."

In 1549, after previous petitions, Pope Julius III. issued a Bull authorising the secularisation of the chapter, which up to this date had lived in community under the rule of St. Augustine. In it the Pope allowed the chapter to preserve the use of the ancient liturgy of Auch, in case they did not desire to adopt the Roman rite. It was not until the year 1589, that the reformed Roman Missal and Breviary of St. Pius V. were adopted in the diocese; but the Roman Rituale of Pope Paul V. was received in 1616, two years after its first publication.

The Canons, according to ancient custom, chanted the office of the B.V.M. on all days which were not feasts of double rite.

A brief analysis of the Auch Missal of 1491, may be of interest.

After the title-page comes a list of all feasts which have vigils.

The calendar—each month occupying a page, and having at the foot the verse setting forth the two unlucky days in it. In the body of the calendar these days are noted by *Dies eger* in red.

On February 12, is kept the feast of Dedication.

On August 5, St. Oswald of Northumbria is commemorated, and on Dec. 8, "Conceptio sancte Marie cum octava."

On folio 1, "Incipit missale sc̄m usum ecclesie auxitane," with the first Sunday of Advent. The procession before the high mass is to go round the cloister singing the antiphon—*Missus est angelus Gabriel*.

The prose is—*Missus Gabriel de celis*.

For the feriae following, proper lessons from Isaias are provided for the Wednesday and Friday, and proper Gospels for those days and also for the Monday and Saturday.

II. Sunday in Advent. The processional antiphon is *Venite omnes exultemus*. Proper Gospels for Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, and proper lessons for the two former.

III. Sunday of Advent. Processional antiphon—*Venite ascendamus*. The epistle is that of the Fourth Sunday according to the Roman rite.

IV. Sunday of Advent. A second introit in addition to *Rorate cœli* is provided, viz., *Memento nostri Domine*. The epistle is that of the Third Sunday of Roman rite; and the Graduale, *Tollite portas*.

Lessons from Zachary and Daniel, and proper Gospels for the Wednesday and Friday.

If the vigil of Christmas fall on Sunday, the morning or parochial mass is to be of the Sunday, and the high mass of the vigil. The latter has a lesson from Isaias in place of an epistle, and lessons from this prophet also take the place of the epistles on Christmas Day.

The collects of the "Mass at Dawn" and of St. Anastasia are to be said together—*sub uno fine*. Before the third mass the procession is to go first to the altar of St. Mary singing the R—*Sancta et immaculata*; and then round the cloister singing this antiphon:—

O Maria jesse virga: celi regina: maris stella: plenitudo temporis: ecce iam venit: iam olim promissum florem protulisti: ergo precamur domina: ut qui te meruimus confiteri Christi matrem sentiamus et piam: ut singulari merito hunc nobis tu facias placabilem: diesque istos tue sancte virginitatis partum dicatos bene nobis ipse propter te o benignissima disponat: quo temporalis solemnitas nos ad eternam enutriet leticiam. Alleluia.

The Prose is *Letabundus exultet fidelis chorus*.

Epiphany.—The Prose is *Epiphaniam domino canamus gloriosam*. The Sundays after Epiphany are counted from the octave.

Ash Wednesday.—The benediction of the ashes is shorter than in the Roman rite. It commences with the prayer *Deus qui non mortem, &c.* (verbal differences); then follows:—

Benedictio dei patris omnipotentis: et filii: et spiritus sancti descendat et maneat super hos cineres; and the antiphon *Exaudi, &c.* Ostende nobis, &c. Et salutarem, &c. Kyrie. Pater noster. Deus misereatur nobis. Peccavimus cum patribus nostris; and the collect *Concede*.

Then begins the antiphon *Immutemur*, during the singing of which the priest places the ashes on his own head and on the heads of others saying:—*Memento quia cinis es et in cinerem ibis: pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris: itaque age penitentiam de omnibus peccatis tuis.*

There are no commemorations in the Masses of Lent.

First Sunday in Lent. Antiphon at the procession—*Cum sederit filius hominis.*

The introit of the Second Sunday is *Domine dilexi decorem domus tui, &c.*

The antiphon at the procession on the Fourth Sunday is *Christe pater misericordiarum*, and on Passion Sunday, *In die cum venerit Dominus.*

In the Ferial Masses of Lent are some slight differences from those in the Roman Missal.

On Palm Sunday the procession is to go round the cloisters singing the antiphon as on the Fourth Sunday, and then proceed to the appointed place singing the *Collegerunt pontifices*. On arrival, Tierce is to be said, and the Gospel (Matt. xxi., Cum appropinquasset Jesus) sung, facing northwards, and a sermon delivered. This ended, the bishop, or priest, facing eastwards, blesses the boughs and palms, saying the following proper prayers:—*Hec tibi Domine dies festa, &c.*, addressed to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity and ending in a long proper Preface—*mundi redemptor qui de celis, &c.*, without the *Sanctus*. *Deus cujus filius*—a shortened form of the prayer in the Sarum Missal. *Benedictio dei omnipotentis patris et filii et spiritus sancti descendat et maneat super hos ramos. Amen.* The palms are then sprinkled with holy-water but not incensed, and immediately distributed during the singing twice of *Pueri hebreorum, &c.* Four anthems—*Turba multa, Occurrerunt turbe, Ave Rex noster, Cum appropinquaret*—are provided for the return of the procession. Being come to the door of the church, the procession stands without, while two or four boys or clerks, *super murum porte*, sing the *Gloria laus et honor, &c.*, the fourth verse of which reads—“*Plebs Sancti N. cum ramis obviam venit cum prece et voto hymnos canimus ecce tibi.*” This verse being ended, the celebrant receiving a rod or staff from the hand of the door-keeper,*

* “*De manu porterii*”—note the use of this word for “*ostiarii*.”

knocks at the door, saying, Attolite portas, &c. The boys answer, "Quis est iste rex glorie?" and the priest replies, "Dominus fortis et potens, dominus potens in prelio," and again knocks, saying, Attolite, &c., and again is answered, Quis, &c., and the priest replies as before and knocks a third time, and receives the same answer, whereupon the priest finally says, "Dominus virtutum ipse est rex glorie," and the doors are opened. The clergy and people enter singing the response, Ingrescente—excelsis, with *Ÿ* Hodie redemptor, &c. When the Passion is sung myrrh is placed in the thurible instead of incense. After the words "emisit spiritum," a Pater noster is said. This is likewise said after the corresponding words of the Passion during Holy Week.

Alternative lessons from the prophet Zachary and the Book of Wisdom are provided for the Monday and Tuesday following. According to the rubric—On Maundy Thursday the people are to be summoned to church by the sound of a trumpet—hora nona—and fire is struck from a flint. After None the priest, clad in his vestments, is to bless the new fire before the altar—but the proper collect for this is omitted. The prayer for the *Benedictio incensi* follows. Then the mass is solemnly celebrated. The *Gloria in excelsis* and *Credo* are to be sung only when the Chrism is consecrated. "Omnes devote communicent et sanguis domini hac die penitus sumatur." The *Communio* having been said, while the *chorus* say Vespers, the Body of Our Lord is to be reverently carried by the deacon to the place where It is to be kept—preceded by incense and lights, and six ministers supporting a spotless canopy over It. The deacon and his assistants are to sing, "Hoc corpus quod pro vobis tradetur: hic calix novi testamenti est in meo sanguine dicit dominus: hoc facite quotienscumque sumitis in meam commemorationem. The deacon, after placing the host in the receptacle prepared for it, which is never to be left without lights, is directed to return to the altar saying Vespers on his way in a low tone. The antiphon at the Magnificat is doubled if the Chrism be consecrated. Then is sung the Post Communion. When the Chrism is consecrated the deacon sings, Ite missa est, otherwise, Benedicamus Domino. "And so the Mass is ended in Vespers."

On Good Friday after None the divine office is to be

solemnly celebrated. The bishop, or priest, vested in alb and cope, accompanied by the archdeacon, the chaplain, and ministers bearing a rod, round which is the sculptured figure of a serpent, with lights approach the altar and say silently the collect, *Deus qui peccatis veteris, &c.*

“*Flectamus genua*” is not to be said at the prayer for the perfidious Jews, “*auctoritate celestini pape.*”

The prayers being ended, “*finitis prefationibus*”—two canons, bowing with reverence to the cross, hold it up covered with a veil, and sing “in the person of Christ hanging on the wood,” the *Ant. Populus meus, &c.*, and the *Ÿ Quia eduxi te de terra, &c.*, which, being finished, the archbishop, with the deacon, sub-deacon, and others kneeling together (if he be absent the celebrant and deacon) before the altar say the *Agios—imas*, and the chorus humbly kneeling repeat, *Sanctus Deus, &c.* Then the two canons standing before the altar and holding the cross, again sing, *Quia eduxi te per desertum, &c.*, and the archbishop with his ministers kneeling on the second step of the altar repeat the *Agios* as above, and the chorus answer, *Sanctus Deus, &c.* The two canons, *Quid ultra debui, &c.*, and the archbishop kneeling on the third step repeats the *Agios* as before. The two holding the cross then uncover the right side, singing, *Ecce lignum crucis*, and the chorus sing the remainder—in quo salus mundi pependit: *venite adoremus*, with the *Ÿ Beati immaculati in via, &c.* Then the left side is shown in the same manner with the *Ÿ Beati qui scrutantur*. Then the whole cross is shown and the chorus finish the anthem, their voices being successively raised at each ostention. One of the canons then takes the crucifix and places it with honour and reverence in the place prepared for it; and the bishop, or celebrant, says six prayers—*Domine Jesu Christe adoro te in crucem pendentem, &c.*

Then follows the Adoration—the psalm *Miserere mei* being said in a low voice. Twelve antiphons are provided for the chorus to sing during the Adoration, after which the celebrant and the deacon carry back the cross to the altar, saying this antiphon, “*Super omnia ligna cedrorum tu sola excelsior: in qua vita mundi pependit: in qua Christus triumphavit et mors mortem superavit in eternum,*” and replace it.

The archbishop, or priest, then goes to the vestry and takes

off his cope, and puts on the chasuble (planetam), and returns to the altar with his ministers clad in albs and sandals. The candles are then lighted, and a linen cloth placed on the altar. The Host is then brought back with the same ceremonies as on the previous day—preceded by taper-bearers in albs, and by the sub-deacon with smoking thurible, while the antiphon, *Hoc corpus, &c.*, is sung. The celebrant having said the *Confiteor*, the deacon spreads the corporal on the altar, and pours wine into the chalice, and places reverently on the paten the Body of the Lord. The celebrant then mingles water with the wine, and, bowing down, says silently, *In spiritu humilitatis, &c.* Rising, he says, *Oremus Preceptis, &c.* Before saying “*Fiat voluntas tua,*” he takes the Body of Christ, and while he *sings* “*Sicut in celo,*” he elevates It, so as to be seen by the people, and when he says “*Et in terra,*” he replaces It, and continues the Lord’s Prayer in the same tone. “And this method of showing the Host is observed at the present day only in the church of Auch,” says the rubric.*

The *Libera nos* is said silently. Immediately after the priest has communicated, Vespers are said, and the celebrant begins the antiphon of the Magnificat, and the prayer *Respice* is said as a Post Communion, without *Dominus vobiscum, &c.*

On Holy Saturday the people are to be summoned to church before None, “*sonitu signorum,*” and the bishop, or priest, vested in a cope, blesses the New Fire with the prayer, *Deus qui Moysi famulo tuo, &c.*, and the incense, as on Maundy Thursday. Then “the Paschal candle is blessed by the deacon in the church,” according to custom. The Exultet is entitled, “*Benedictio cerei quam Zozimus papa constituit,*” and in it are some verbal differences, additions, and omissions. The grains of incense are to be affixed in the form of a star. After *apis mater eduxit*, is added, *O vere beata nox et mirabilis apis cuius nec sexum masculi violant fedus: non*

* This gives the point to the remark of Canon du Sendat, as appears from the “*Voyages Liturgiques*” of Le Brun des Marettes, p. 58. At Lyon “le célébrant ne fait point l’élévation de l’hostie et du calice ensemble à *omnis honor et gloria*, mais à ces paroles—*sicut in celo* il l’élève, et à *et in terra* il l’abaisse,” &c. This is noted on behalf of the liturgical principle—“des paroles qui attirent les actions, et des actions qui accompagnent les paroles”—a very true principle, but driven to death by De Vert and his imitators. De Vert seems not to have known this instance, as he does not appear to have had access to the Auch books.

quassant: nec filii destruunt castitatem. Sit sancta concepit virgo Maria: virgo peperit et virgo permansit.

The bishop, or priest, standing at the altar in his cope, before reading the Prophecies, is to say silently the prayer, Deus qui divitias, of the Gregorian sacramentary. There are only four lessons and collects, with three tracts.

Then comes the tract "Sicut cervus" and a proper collect. The litany is said going to the font. It is very short. After Sancta Maria—S. Michael, All angels and archangels; SS. John Baptist, Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, All apostles and evangelists; SS. Stephen, Saturnin, Laurence, Vincent, and Antonine, All holy martyrs; SS. Marcial, Silvester, Gregory, Jerome, Exuperus, Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary and Martin, All pontiffs and confessors; SS. Benedict, Giles, Gerald, All monks and hermits; SS. Mary Magdalene, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, All virgins and All saints—follow fifteen supplications, among which are:—Ut ad festa ventura nos preparare digneris—Ut fontem istum benedicere ✠ digneris—Ut fontem istam benedicere et sanctificare digneris—Ut fontem istum benedicere et sanctificare et consecrare ✠ digneris—Fili Dei—ending with the Agnus Dei. The form of benediction is short, the Paschal candle is dipped once only in the water, and the chrism only is mixed with it.

The celebrant and his ministers are then directed to put on their festal vestments, and, on their approaching the altar, the chanters sing with a loud voice, *Accendite*, and the chorus answers, *Deo Gratias*. Again, and a third time, *Accendite* is sung with *Deo Gratias*, after which *Kyrie eleyson* is begun, and the bishop or priest, having said the Confiteor, is directed to say the prayer—Deus qui matutinam sacre resurrectionis tue, &c., and then begin the Gloria in excelsis. When the celebrant is about to communicate, all the bells (signa) are to be solemnly rung, "ad vespertas." The chanter in the choir with a loud voice begins the antiphon of Vespers—Pascha nostrum Christus est qui immolatus agnus est: etenim pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus. The Gloria Patri after the psalm is repeated thrice, and then the antiphon "Pascha," &c., thrice. After the Magnificat, Alleluia is to be sung nine times, and then its antiphon, *Vespere*, &c., repeated. The rubric goes on to say,

"By the Roman custom *Benedicamus Domino* is said, but we say, *Ite missa est*, with double Alleluia."

On Easter Day the antiphon at the procession is *Postquam resurrexit a mortuis, &c.*, with the *R* *Christus resurgens ex mortuis, &c.* Before the last verse of the Prose, *Victima Paschali* is the verse—

Credendum est magis soli Marie veraci quam iudeorum turbi fallaci. This Prose is not said during the octave. The Sundays following are counted from the octave. On Ascension Day the prose is, *Rex omnipotens die hodierna.*

On the vigil of Pentecost four Prophecies are read, and the rest is as on Holy Saturday. At the end of the Mass a double alleluia is added to *Ite missa est.*

On the feast of Pentecost the antiphon at the procession is *Spiritus sanctus hodie*, and the Prose, *Sancti spiritus adsit nobis gratia* is not said during the octave.

On the "*Dominica prima post Penthecosten*," the lesson is from the Apocalypse, *iiii.—Vidi ostium apertum.* The gradual has three *Y* differing from the Roman. Prose—*Profitentes unitatem veneremur trinitatem pari reverentia.* The Gospel is from S. John *iii.* : *Erat homo ex phariseis Nichodemus—vitam eternam.*

The Prose, *Lauda Syon*, is to be sung daily during the octave of Corpus Christi. The last Sunday after Pentecost is entitled "*Sunday before the advent of the Lord.*"

Then comes the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass. The priest is to say before the altar, after the Confiteor, the prayer of S. Ambrose : *Deus qui de indignis dignos.*

The prayer before the Gospel ends with the words, "*per te Iesu Christe.*"

The prayer "*ad evangelium*" : *Ave verbum divinum : reformatio virtutum : restitutio sanitatum. Qui tecum.*

"*Ad Corporale*"—*In tuo conspectu quesumus domine hec nostra munera tibi placita sint : ut nos tibi placere valeamus. Per.*

"*Ad hostiam*" : *Acceptabilis sit omnipotens deus hec oblatio quam tibi offerimus pro reatibus et facinoribus nostris : et pro stabilitate ecclesie sancte catholice. Amen.*

"*Ad mixtum*" : *Ex latere Christi sanguis et aqua exisse*

perhib^o et ideo pariter commiscem^o : ut misericors deus utrumque ad medelam animarum nostrarum sanctificare dignetur. Qui.

“Ad calicem” : Offerimus tibi, &c.

Postea sequitur benedictio. In nomine sancte trinitatis et individue unitatis descendat angelus benedictionis et consecrationis super hoc munus. Per.

The oblations of the people having been received and the sacrifice placed on the altar, the prayer, In spiritu, &c., is to be said.

After the Benediction, &c., of the Incense comes :—“Orate fratres pro me peccatore ad dominum, ut meum sacrificium vestrumque votum sit deo acceptum. Response : Suscipiat omnipotens deus sacrificium de manibus tuis et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua.

Here follow the prefaces, as in the Roman Ordinary. Then (1) Gloria in excelsis ; (2) the Creed, with a long rubric directing when it is to be said. Among other feasts it is to be recited at nuptial masses—on days when processions are made and the bells solemnly rung, and on the feasts of all Saints mentioned in the Canon of the Mass.

(3) The prayer of S. Augustine, Summe sacerdos.

(4) The Gloria in excelsis with musical notation for—(a) Feasts of the B. Virgin ; (b) Within Octaves ; (c) Double Feasts ; (d) Feasts of nine lessons ; (e) Feasts of Angels.

(5) The Pater noster, noted for (a) Feriae days ; (b) Festivals.

(6) Rubric relating to the Proper Prefaces.

(7) A woodcut of the Crucifixion with SS. Mary and John, and two angels collecting in chalices the blood flowing from the hands of Our Lord. Above are the Sun and Moon.

Then comes the Canon of the Mass.

After the words Papa nostro N. are the words “et rege nostro N.”

After the Pax—*Fiat commixtio*—Christi accipientibus nobis *salus*.

Agnus Dei—miserere nobis—is to be said thrice.

There is no rubric for the repetition of Domine non sum dignus, &c.

The blessing is thus given : In unitate sancti spiritus benedicat nos pater et filius. Amen.

After the Canon are forty-six votive masses. Of those of Our Lady—*Rorate* for Saturdays in Advent contains the Prose Ave Maria gratia plena, Dominus tecum, Virgo serena; and *Salve Sancta Parens* for the time from the Octave of the Purification to Advent, has the farsed Gloria in excelsis—as in the Sarum Missal. Two Proses are provided, from Septuagesima to Easter: Verbum bonum et suave—Personemus illud ave; for Paschal-tide: Virginis Marie laudes intonant christiani.

The mass Pro mortalitate hominum evitanda “Our Lord Pope Clement VI. has ordered to be said.” At the end of it the introit—Puer natus est—of Christmas-day is to be read.

Then follows the Benediction of the Bridegroom’s gifts and the ring: Benedic Domine has arras, &c., and Domine D.P.O. qui in similitudinem sancti cōnubii, &c. After the ring has been placed on the finger of the bride, the priest is directed to lead them by the hand into the church and to sprinkle them with holy water. The bride is placed on the left of the bridegroom before the altar till the end of the rite. From the octave of the Epiphany to Septuagesima is to be said the mass of Blessed Mary, *Vultum tuum*: from the Octave of Easter to the Ascension, the mass *Resurrexi et adhuc*: from the octave of Pentecost to Advent the mass of the Holy Trinity, with the proper prayers under one ending. Gloria in excelsis and the Credo are always to be said on account of the dignity and honour of the nuptial rite.

A proper nuptial mass then follows, the collect *Exaudi nos*, from the Gelasian sacramentary, the Epistle from 1 Corinthians vi., the Gospel from S. Matthew xix., and the Secreta *Suscipe* from the Leonian sacramentary. Before the priest says, Pax Domini, the couple are to approach the altar—“juxta cancellos,” and the ministers placing them side by side, the bride on the left, the priest “tunc velat eos” putting the veil on the shoulders of the bridegroom and on the head of the bride, saying: In nomine Patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Amen. “Et ponat jugalem super humeros eorum.” He then says over them, Salvos fac servos tuos, &c., followed by the collect Propitiare, and the prayer, Deus qui potestate (both from the Gregorian sacramentary) sung as a preface. The mass being ended he turns to them, and taking the right hand of the bridegroom and the left hand of the bride says:

In nomine, &c. Deus Abraham, deus Isaac, deus Jacob ipse sit vobiscum: et ipse vos conjungat: impleatque benedictionem suam in vobis. Amen. He then leads them by the hand out of the church, saying: In nominis, &c., ambulate in pace.

At the blessing "ante lectum," the newly married couple are to take off their shoes and lie on the bed, as is the custom, and the priest sprinkling them and the bed with holy-water says the Asperges and psalm Miserere. Then comes the antiphon Signum salutis, with *Ÿ Ostende*, &c., Domine exaudi, and the collect. "Tunc nubentes intrent lectum," and, the priest incensing them, says the psalm—Beati omnes qui timent dominum, with Kyrie eleison, Pater noster, Salvum fac, and other versicles and responses, and the prayer, Benedicat vos omnipotens nostri oris, &c., and the Benediction.

In dedicatione ecclesie, a proper preface is provided differing somewhat from the one in the Leofric Missal of Exeter,

eterne deus per xpm dm nrm, per quem te domine supplices deprecamur: ut hoc altare sanctis usibus preparatum: celesti dedicatione sanctifices: ut sicut melchisedech sacerdotis precipui oblationem dignanter suscepisti: ita imposita novo huic altari munera semper accepta ferre digneris: ut populus qui in hanc ecclesie domum convertit: per hec libamina celesti sanctificatione salvatur: animarum quoque suarum salutem perpetuam consequantur: et ideo.

Then follow masses: Of the Crown of Our Lord Jesus Christ at the time of His passion. Of the Five Wounds of Christ: "To the sayers or hearers of which Pope John XII. has granted cc. days of indulgence;" Prose, Cenam cum discipulis. Of the Feast of the Holy Winding-Sheet; Prose, Ave Christi sudarium. Of the Holy Tear of Christ;* Prose, O lachryma gloriosa Christi preclarissima.† De Nomine Jesu. "Whosoever shall celebrate devoutly, or cause to be celebrated this mass in veneration of the name of Jesus Christ, shall not die during the thirty days following without contrition, worthy satisfaction, the most holy Communion, and the oil of unction; and within thirty days of his death shall attain everlasting

* There is a treatise by Mabillon on the relic of the Tear of Christ, brought from the Holy Land by Geoffrey Martel, Count of Anjou, and preserved in the Abbey of the Holy Trinity, Vendôme.

† Printed in Weale and Misset's *Analecta Liturgica*, fas. iv. 269. This prose in the Auch books is shorter than the one therein quoted from various French Missals.

joys, and have by the said mass 3000 years of indulgence granted by our Lord Pope Boniface." The Prose is Dulce Jesus Nazareus.

Then commences the Proper of Saints with the Mass of S. Stephen the proto-martyr. This part contains numerous proses for various feasts.

R. TWIGGE, F.S.A.

ART. VI.—BELLS AND BELL CUSTOMS.

THERE can be but little doubt that the use of church bells in England is almost coeval with the introduction of Christianity into the country; strictly speaking, the first bells that were used to summon our ancestors to worship could not be called "church bells," as they existed before any Christian churches were in being in the land. We have it on good authority that the early missionary preachers who visited Britain carried with them hand bells which were used to attract the people together, and then the Gospel of Christ was preached to them; it is said that some slight natural rise in the ground was chosen for the bell ringer to stand upon. These hand bells were not cast in moulds as was afterwards customary, but were rudely made, being formed of sheets of metal strongly riveted together and somewhat wedge-shaped; they varied in size, the smallest ones being about five inches high, the largest somewhere between nine and ten, and there were all sizes between these figures.

We do not know the exact date when bells in the modern sense of the term were first introduced into this country; Bede mentions one in the seventh century as being in use at Whitby.* Before the art of ringing was understood, the bells used to be struck by a man, by means of a hammer. Some time during the tenth century St. Dunstan is said to have cast bells for Canterbury, and also to have drawn up a series of rules for the guidance of those whose duty it was to ring them. It is recorded that, in 1050, Leofric, Bishop of Exeter, gave six bells to the cathedral; and we see from the institution of the curfew that a few years later bells were known to be in almost every village church.

It was at that time, and so continued to be, considered an act of piety to present bells to churches of higher or lower degree. In 1180 Geoffrey Plantagenet, who then held the temporalities of the see of Lincoln, gave two fine bells to the cathedral of that city.

But the mere presentation of a bell or bells was not con-

* "Ecccl. His." book, iv. c. xxiii., Gidley's translation.

sidered by our forefathers to be sufficient; before they found their resting-place in the tower to which they were destined there was held a solemn dedicating service, usually known by the name of "The Baptism of the Bells."

The ceremonial was a grand one, full of quaint ritual, but the main feature of it was the washing of the bell by the Bishop with water into which salt was thrown; it was then dried by the attendants, after which the Bishop dipped his thumb into the Holy Oils used for anointing the sick, and made the sign of the cross at the top of the bell.

Various other observances of a ceremonial nature followed, and then the Bishop again anointed the bell with oil, using a proper form of baptismal words. Bells had sponsors to answer for them, often the donors, and the baptismal service was somewhat closely followed, though of course it varied in some details. Bells very often had each a distinctive name, and in some instances these names have never been forgotten by the people who have forgotten so much. These names arose, we know not how; in some cases, no doubt, they were given by their sponsors, but in others it must have been that they were given by the people of the village for some local reason that we shall never fathom, and now centuries afterwards their descendants are still using the same name, though, like "Great Tom" of Lincoln, the bell may have been recast more than once. To this day the bell at the top of the middle tower at Canterbury Cathedral is always spoken of as "Bell Harry." When bells were dedicated to saints they often got known by the name of their patron.

Cathedrals and large churches had often a second ring of bells, and this second peal was usually distinguished by some local name.

At Lincoln it was called "The Lady Bells," because they hung in the tower which was dedicated more especially to Our Lady. There is no complete list of the inscriptions to be found upon the bells of Britain; though the churches in some counties have been thoroughly examined and the facts relating to the bells recorded in goodly volumes, but very much yet remains to be done. It is much to be wished that each diocese would form a committee and have the bells thoroughly overhauled, but the expenses of bringing out really good books

upon bells are very great, owing to the necessity of the engravings and woodcuts being of a high order. The earliest inscriptions that we find are of course in Latin and undated; it is rarely a thirteenth or fourteenth century bell is found dated; there is one, however, at St. Chad's, Cloughton, Lancashire, bearing the following inscription:

ANNO DNI·M·CC· NO NO·AI.*

The V is upside down, an event not uncommonly to be found in the letters and figures upon bells. A great many bells were dedicated as was natural to Our Lady, and though many of them have only the simple inscription AVE MARIA, yet others had much longer and more ornate mottoes upon them. At Halvergate, in Norfolk, the 5th bell bears upon it INTERCEDE PIA PRO VIRGO MIRIA, and at Burton Coggles, Lincolnshire, the 3rd bell has on it SANCTA MARIA ORA PRO NOBIS; whilst we find at East Dean, Sussex, the 1st bell sets forth HAL MARI FVL OF GRAS.

Bells were naturally placed under the protection of, and dedicated to the saints, St. Gabriel being much favoured in this respect. At Springthorpe, in Lincolnshire, there it a bell dedicated to St. George bearing upon it GEORGIVS CAMPANA VOS SONAT DVLCITER BENE. To the best of my knowledge there are scarcely any old bells in England bearing inscriptions excepting in Latin or English, and when the latter tongue began to be thus used, some of the inscriptions are more amusing than edifying. At Bradford in Yorkshire, there is upon a bell

AT PROPER TIMES MY VOICE I'LL RAISE
AND SOUND TO MY SUBSCRIBERS PRAISE.

But some of the mottoes in the vulgar tongue are very beautiful, such as the one on the 4th bell at Eaton, Leicestershire:

JHESVS BE OVR SPEED 1589

And the one upon the 2nd bell at Shipton, Hampshire,

GOD BE OVR GUYD.

At Sawley, in Derbyshire, there is an inscription upon the

* "English Bells and Bell Lore," Thomas North, 1888, ch. ii. p. 10.

3rd bell, GOD SAVE HIS CHURCH 1591 ; this is a rather curious instance of what may be termed a double meaning, for there is nothing said to show whether is meant the Church as by law established or that Church for which Pole laboured, and Thomas More died ; but in all likelihood it was the latter one that was referred to ; had it been the former one most likely it would have been more clearly expressed. Political events are sometimes indicated by the words upon bells that were cast about the time of their occurrence ; the last child of Henry VIII. who sat upon the throne of England passed away from this life in 1603, and Mary Stuart's son ascended the throne ; this seems to have been commemorated at Stanford-upon-Stour, in Nottinghamshire, one of the bells there bearing upon it, GOD SAVE OUR KING 1603 ; afterward this is very commonly found upon bells. At Bury, in Sussex, occurs the earliest instance I have come across of the following ; common enough as it became in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is on the 2nd bell, GOD SAVE THE QUEN 1599 AO DOMENI. H. T. We find at Elford, in Staffordshire, upon the 3rd bell, GOD SAVE OUR KING 1631 ; a curious commentary upon what was so shortly to follow : the man who gave, or the person who cast that bell could not see Edgehill, Marston Moor, and the tragedy of Whitehall, looming darkly in the years to come ; yet the handwriting on the wall was already there, and some few had obtained a glimpse of it. We find it again at Hellidon, Northamptonshire, in 1635, with one word only changed, for OUR in this case read THE.

With slight variations this inscription is used throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ; sometimes the sovereign is mentioned by name, as at Melksham, where the 3rd bell says :

GOD SAVE QUEEN ANNE. PEACE AND GOOD NEIGHBOURHOOD.
A.R. 1703.

A.R. being most likely the initials of the donor of the bell or of the incumbent of the parish, but it is more probably the former. The 1st bell at Stapleton has upon it :

FREE FROM REBELLION. GOD SAVE THE KING 1694.

Many bells bear couplets which show they that were meant to be more especially used upon certain occasions ; at Rowde, in Wiltshire, there is the following inscription on the 5th bell :

I TO THE CHURCH THE LIVING CALL,
AND TO THE GRAVE DO SUMMON ALL.

This is clearly intended to indicate that the bell was meant to be rung as the passing-bell and at funerals, and it occurs very frequently, either exactly in these words or with very slight variations.

Bells intended especially to be rung at weddings not infrequently have upon them this rhyme with various alterations; in the present case the verse I quote* is to be found upon the 5th bell at St. Helen's Church, Abingdon :

IN WEDLOCK BANDS ALL YE WHO JOIN
YOUR HANDS WITH HEARTS UNITE
SO SHALL OUR TUNEFUL TONGUES COMBINE
TO LAUD THE NUPTIAL RITE.

There is a somewhat different couplet on the 6th bell at St. Peter's, Nottingham :

THE BRIDE AND GROOM WE GRET IN HOLY WEDLOCK JOIN'D
OUR SOUND ARE EMBLEMS SWEET OF HEARTS IN LOVE COMBINED.

On bells meant to be rung in case of fire, often occur the lines found on the fire-bell at Sherborne, Dorset :

LORD QUENCH THIS FURIOUS FLAME,
ARISE, RUN, HELP, PUT OUT THE SAME.

I.W., I.C. 1652.

The language is a little vague ; it looks as though the Deity were implored to arise and run, but of course this is not what the writer meant. Bells are usually jangled or run backwards when their sound is meant to indicate that they are the means of spreading the news of a fire.

In pre-Reformation times prayers for the dead were at times to be found inculcated upon bells, and a late instance of it is to be seen at St. Peter's Church, Shaftesbury, Dorset :

WHEN YOU HEAR ME FOR TO TOLL,
THEN PRAY TO GOD TO SAVE THE SOUL.
ANNO DOMINI 1672.

Most likely the explanation of this strangely late date is to

* "An Account of Church Bells," Rev. William C. Lukes, 1857, p. 63.

be found in the fact that the old moulds and letters were used for generations, and that this was an old inscription with merely the current date put to it. In pre-Reformation times what is now usually termed the passing-bell, and rung an hour or two after death, was then really and truly a *passing-bell*, for it was rung when the soul appeared to be at the point of doffing the mortal for the immortal; but before death had actually taken place. Its object was to let people know by its solemn sound that one amongst them was *in extremis*, and to remind them that it was their duty to spare a few minutes from the cares of this world to pray that the soul so soon to be beyond earthly help, might turn towards God and His saints. Then some time after death had taken place it was again rung, and this time it was known as the Soul-bell, and was sounded to let all know that the time for earthly contrition had passed away, and to beg them to pray for the final repose of the departed.

Bells are, and were, rung on many occasions not actually connected with the services of the Church; whenever a bishop visited a parish he was (and is) welcomed by the sound of its bells. We find that in 1473 the churchwardens of St. John the Baptist, Peterborough, charged in their accounts:

1473: Itm̄ paid for ryngyng yeuse my Lord of Lynckcoln at his Vysytacyon, ijd.

Peterborough being then a part of the vast See of Lincoln. It appears that upon these occasions the recompense of the ringers sometimes took another form; thus in the churchwardens' accounts at Melton Mowbray, we find an entry under 1557:

Itm̄ pd. for a galland of ale to ye Reyngers when ye bychype was here ijd.

In 1611 they had improved at Rotherham upon the Melton Mowbray manner of spelling Bishop, and it is decidedly many degrees nearer the modern fashion:

1611: Item paid for ringing at the Byshopps being at Rotherham, 13d.

Roman figures too had come to be used.*

* The three above quotations are taken from "English Bells and Bell Lore." Thomas North, F.S.A., ch. ix. pp. 79, 80.

[No. 15 of *Fourth Series*.]

Sermons were considered of grave importance, and the Royal Injunctions of 1547 order a bell to be knolled before the sermon.

The name of "Sermon Bell" has lingered long after the time at which the bell was rung has altered.

In some Lincolnshire churches the last bell that is rung, after the chiming has ceased, is still known as "The Sermon Bell."

Shakespeare mentions this bell in Henry IV., Act 4, sc. 2 :

Prince John :—My Lord of York, it better show'd with you,
When that your flock, assembled by the bell,
Encircled you, to hear with reverence
Your exposition on the holy text.

Bells were rung in various places at six o'clock in the morning to let workmen know when they ought to begin the labours of the day, and at the same hour in the evening to show when labour was ended. The 5th bell at St. John's, Coventry, has upon it :

I ring at six to let men know
When to and from their work to go.

There was some time ago, at Barnwell in Leicestershire, a custom which I have not been able to find in any other place, though no doubt it occurs. When an unmarried woman died it was usual to chime what was known as her "wedding peal" while the body was being carried to the church; instances of muffled peals rung upon like occasions are by no means uncommon.

The ringing of the last Angelus or Curfew bell is too common even now to require any special mention; it has never died out in some places, whilst in others it is a mere modern revival. It has become the general custom of late years to usher in Christmas Day with a peal on the church bells; in some places it has been done from time immemorial; on New Year's Eve it is now usual to ring out the dying year with a muffled peal, and then to salute his successor with a glorious chime; I have not found any trace of this New Year's peal in pre-Reformation times, but, if not customary then, it must have arisen soon afterwards, for the churchwardens' accounts of

Kirton-in-Lindsey, Lincolnshire, give the following for the year 1632 :

Item to the ringers of new yeare day morninge xijd.

It was the custom before the Reformation to ring the bells as little as possible from Shrove Tuesday until Easter Day ; and in some cases they were not rung at all, only chimed. Of course they were sounded at the time of certain of the services. Sometimes a peal was rung at midnight on Easter Eve to signify that the fast of Lent was now a thing of the past for that year ; there seems to be some reason for thinking that, in certain places, during Easter week the bells must have been rung much more than in the ordinary course of things ; the churchwardens' accounts of Ludlow contain for 1556-7 the following entry :

Item to Rushburie for makynge a breakfast to those that ryng day bell in Easter weke, xijd.

This may mean that during Easter week the bell was rung early every morning just after twelve o'clock.

In any reasonable amount space it would be quite impossible to give even a bare list of the various time, and seasons at which bells were rung, and the modifications and variations which have been made in these customs, partly intentionally, partly by the slow but perhaps mere certain process of the passing of time.

All the ancient customs have not been gathered together, though of late years very much has been done to show us what were the methods in use in early times. Very few people realise the amount of destruction that took place in regard to bells during the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, and again when Puritanism was in the ascendant during the following century ; to quote only one instance—the bell-house in St. Paul's Churchyard contained four magnificent bells, said to be the largest in London.

They were called the "Jesus Bells." This bell-house had a tall spire formed of timber and covered with lead ; at the top there was an image of St. Paul. Sir Miles Partridge is reported to have won the bells at a cast of dice from Henry VIII., the story is slightly improbable, but whether it really happened

or not it is quite certain that by some means or other Sir Miles possessed himself of them ; pulled down the bell-house, and broke up the bells. (During the following reign he was hanged on Tower Hill.)

Bell metal was valuable, and thus bells were included amongst the other Church property confiscated, and the bells and bell metal thus became the property of the State. Certain private persons imitated the example thus set and appropriated them to any use they thought good. At Sidbrook, in Lincolnshire, two of the bells were sold for £20, and the money so obtained was used in certain repairs needed by the church and in cleaning out the haven which was filled up with sand.*

Change ringing is, comparatively speaking, a modern invention ; it was unknown in the Middle Ages. "A peal" is the whole number of changes that it is possible to ring on any given number of bells.

Many series of changes have been invented, and these are usually designated by the names of the men who composed them.

One of the earliest of these was Fabian Steadman ; he was a Cambridge man, and some time about 1657 he invented a very intricate form of change ringing which is known as "Steadman's method."

One well-known series called "Grandsine Triptels" was invented by a Mr. Benjamin Anable, who died in 1755.†

People who are not accustomed to the ringing of church bells, have little idea of the great care that is needed to prevent accidents ; they very often occur by men being drawn up by the ropes, a man was killed in this manner at Doncaster in 1778.

Rules for ringing and ringers are to be found in some churches, and they are at times very quaint. I quote the following from Collinson's "History of Somerset" (vol. ii. p. 336) as being little known and a fair specimen of what bell rules are like ; they are in the church of North Parret.

* "Church Bells of Lincolnshire," 1882, p. 35. Thomas North, F.S.A.

† "An Account of Church Bells," 1857, p. 41. The Rev. W. C. Lukes, F.S.A.

He that in ringing takes delight,
And to this place draws near
These articles set in his sight
Must keep, if he rings here.

The first he must observe with care;
Who comes within the door,
Must, if he chance to curse or swear,
Pay Sixpence to the poor.

And whosoe'er a noise does make,
Or idle story tells,
Must Sixpence to the ringers take
For mending of the bells.

Young men that come to see and lay,
And do not ringing use,
Must Sixpence give the company,
And that shall them excuse.

He that his hat on's head does keep,
Within this sacred place
Must pay his Sixpence ere he sleep,
Or turn out with disgrace.

If anyone with spurs to's his heels
Rings here at any time,
He must for breaking articles
Pay Sixpence for his crime,

If any overthrow a bell,
As that perchance he may,
Because he minds not ringing well
He must his Sixpence pay.

Or if a noble-minded man
Comes here to ring a bell,
A tester is the sexter's fee
Who keeps the church so well.

Who ever breaks an article
Or duty does neglect
Must never meddle with a bell
The rope will him correct.

A tester was in the time of Henry VIII. equal to about twelve pence. I have not attempted to deal with church bells fully in this paper; it would not be possible to do so in a limited space. I have never even mentioned the Sanctus bell,

the Sacring bell, and the Priest's bell ; these would occupy a paper devoted solely to them ; nor have I alluded to the heraldic side of the subject nor to the varied and most beautiful lettering and ornamentation to be found upon bells. . These subjects deserve especial attention devoting to them, and an exhaustive treatise might with great advantage to our knowledge be written, but it would be too long for the pages of a Review.

FLORENCE PEACOCK.

ART. VII.—THE LIGHT OF FAITH.

WE offer in the following pages a few remarks on this very important subject. We intend to select a few points which may be of some interest to the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW, instead of attempting a complete treatise on the subject. We are profoundly convinced that the time has come to discuss the fundamental problems of Catholic Theology, not only in the schools, but in public. These momentous questions ought to find their place in the current literature of the day. There is a special need of English works, manuals, treatises and articles on various points of Catholic Theology.

One of our greatest difficulties in dealing with those who have rejected some heretical form of Christianity and become unbelievers, is to get them to perceive that though Catholic and Protestant terminology is to a great extent the same, we Catholics attach a totally different sense to the terms used. Take, for instance, original sin, justification, faith, &c.

Heretical error vitiates all the apologetical works written in favour of Christianity by Protestants, however able or eminent they may be. We have a recent and striking proof of this in Mr. Balfour's clever book : "The Foundations of Belief." We cannot accept their position, however much we may sympathise with their efforts against errors more fundamental and more pernicious than their own.

At present we rejoice at the undeniable reaction against what Protestants call "Naturalism," but what we should call "Unnaturalism," *i.e.*, materialism, atheism, and agnosticism. Human reason protests, as it has ever done, against those monstrous and grotesque forms of unbelief. The reaction does not stop here. The tide is coming in further and further.

The results of historical criticism, at first so bewildering to the minds of many persons, as generally happens when unknown, or forgotten issues are raised, are being carefully criticised and sifted. It is now becoming clearer day by day that, instead of weakening any of the essential proofs of Catholic Christianity, the ascertained conclusions of historical research actually strengthen them. Several *common* opinions

have gone, as has happened so often in the past. *Veritas Domini manet in æternum*. No Catholic truth has been touched. We think it advisable to treat, however imperfectly, a few of the fundamental points underlying the whole range of controversy with the Rationalists and Protestants, rather than to go into the *minutiae* of Biology or History. The Catholic position is simply *unique*, and it is the only position which can be defended with logical consistency against Rationalism. So much by way of introduction to the important question of the nature and scope of Faith according to Catholic teaching. As this article is not controversial, but explanatory, we shall not enter into the manifold and serious errors of various sections of Protestants concerning the nature of faith. They are well known. We shall confine ourselves, therefore, to a brief statement of the Catholic doctrine.

It may be not amiss to recall to the minds of the readers of this REVIEW the able article by Dr. St. George Mivart, in the December number, entitled "Science in Fetters." In approaching the question of faith, we must carefully guard against the phantasmal or mental pictures, which Dr. Mivart has shown to be so obstructive to the progress of true science. We must bear in mind that there is no phantasmal or imaginative picture of the Omnipresence of God. We know *intellectually* that He is everywhere, that He upholds all created beings, that He sustains continuously and positively that existence which He has given, that He co-operates immediately and effectively with every act of the human will and every act of the human intellect, that in Him every human being lives and moves and has its existence, that He is present to every human soul by His Essence, His Knowledge, and His Power. We must get rid of the phantasm by which He is sometimes represented in the imaginative faculty as relegated in the depths of space, having to descend *physically* in order to influence the wills and minds of men. His co-operation with the human intellect, for instance, does not imply the shadow of change in Him. It is effected according to *law* in the natural order, that is to say, it depends on certain conditions — *e.g.*, the normal development of the corporeal organism, &c. The supernatural co-operation is also according to *law*. Certain conditions are necessary, such as the use of reason in

many cases ; though the infusion of the three theological virtues takes place before the use of reason through sacramental baptism conferred on infants. The Divine influence is different in kind in the supernatural order, but does not require any effort or change in activity or position on the part of the Infinite Being.* The perception even of the principle of contradiction cannot take place without the direct and immediate co-operation of the First Cause. Not that God Himself is, in any sense, the *object* of immediate or intuitive perception of the intellect, just as the essence or substance of the soul itself is not the object of direct intuition on part of the intellectual faculty, though so intimately connected with it. Several philosophers and theologians have seriously erred through losing sight of this important distinction.

Let us now assume for the time being that Infinite Wisdom has vouchsafed to communicate to man a positive and supernatural Revelation. Let us assume, leaving aside comparatively unimportant details, that this Revelation embodies rational as well as superrational truths, that is to say, that while it brings superrational truths, or mysteries within the range of the human intellect, it overlaps, but does not completely cover, the sphere of reason : we find that the light of faith and the light of reason are related to each other *per modum excedentis et excessi*, as we say in the schools. The *rational* truths, as we may call them, which have been re-affirmed in positive Revelation are those, and those only, which are connected with man's eternal destiny. The other truths ascertainable by the light of reason do not fall within the sphere illumined by the light of faith.

Let us furthermore assume that this supernatural Revelation has come to us in a manner which accords with the Divine Attributes on the one hand and with human nature on the other, that is, that it has come to us accompanied by such proofs as will leave no prudent or serious doubt in any unbiassed intellect as to its Divine origin. It does not come

* It may be useful to state here that Scotus and his followers are opposed to St. Thomas and the majority of theologians concerning the proof of the Divine omnipresence drawn from the fact that God *acts* in every creature. The former deny the evidence, and even the certainty, of the proposition—*Non datur actio in distans*. All are, of course, agreed as to the Divine omnipresence.

within the scope of this article to analyse the nature and cogency of these proofs. It is sufficient for our present purpose to state that, as a general rule, they constitute moral certainty, that is, in themselves and apart from any supernatural help. It may be well to state, also, that we are not treating *directly* in this article of the *theological virtue* of faith, but of the *act* by which the human intellect assents to supernatural Revelation accompanied, as it is, by sufficient proofs of its Divine origin.

It is scarcely necessary to add that God was not bound to grant this Revelation to man. It is the outcome of His Infinite Charity. There can be, therefore, no such thing as a *a priori* proof of the fact. *If* God had not given it, then the Rationalistic position, inasmuch as Rationalism admits the existence of God, the spirituality and immortality of the soul,* would have been true. Reason, in that order of things, aided, to a certain extent, by Divine Providence, would have been man's sole guide in working out his everlasting *natural* destiny.

We are now brought face to face with the nature of that assent, which man is called upon to give to that Revelation which perfects and goes beyond the *natural* revelation of the Creator. The teaching of the Church is that the assent to be given, in accordance with the Divine purpose, must be *supernatural*, elicited *on account of the authority of God in revealing*, as He can neither deceive nor be deceived, it must be also *free*, because of the influence of the Will aided by grace (*essentially supernatural*, according to the common opinion, or *supernatural in the manner in which it is given* according to Duns Scotus and his followers) in commanding the assent of the intellect. Hence the assent of faith differs in its essence from the assent of the intellect in the natural order to such a truth as the existence of God.

The difference is accounted for by the *supernatural light* in the assent of faith, which is wanting in the natural assent and by the *formal motive*, which, in the assent of faith, is the authority of God as the "very truth." Whereas in the natural assent the *formal motive* is the trustworthiness of

* We are aware that Rationalism, in the concrete, is somewhat like the chameleon and ranges from materialism, atheism, pantheism, and agnosticism, up to a vague and shadowy kind of deism.

human reason. Furthermore the assent of faith is not discursive or ratiocinative, but simple and immediate, and, finally, it is elicited by the command of the will *influenced by grace*. Hence it is that the assent of faith surpasses in the perfect adhesion to Divine Truth any *natural* assent which the intellect can elicit. There are other differences of lesser moment which need not be enumerated here.

The particular point we wish to insist upon is the difference between Catholic and Protestant teaching respecting *faith* and *knowledge*. Protestants contrast them, as a rule, very sharply. The Catholic doctrine is that an adult, in order to give eventual supernatural assent to Revelation, must have a *certain knowledge* of the fact that God has granted a supernatural Revelation. The motives of credibility must be *known* to him in such a manner as to exclude any *reasonable* doubt. If he has only a probable opinion that God has spoken, it is not sufficient. Hence the proposition: "Assensus fidei supernaturalis et utilis ad salutem stat cum notitia solum probabili revelationis, imo cum formidine, qua quis formidet, ne non sit locutus Deus," was condemned by Innocent XI. The assent of faith presupposes *knowledge* on part of the intellect. Otherwise it would be most irrational to say that the will could command the intellect to submit to the Divine Authority in fulfilment of a *certain* obligation. Rationalists very often ask: "What right has the will to *command* the *intellect*?" The objection holds good against the Protestant teaching, urged against Catholic doctrine, it is simply nonsensical. The will cannot urge *anything* on the intellect unless the intellect *itself* perceives some kind of *obligation*. *Nihil volitum, quin præcognitum*. Any reasonable man will allow that the intellect may perceive an undeniable obligation, and the will may persist in refusing to carry it into effect.

Again the Rationalists object to this kind of assent, as it cannot be elicited without supernatural influence, which no one can prove to be granted, as Catholics themselves hold that it is not the object of *reflex* cognition on part of the human intellect. To this objection the reply on the Catholic side is obvious. The supernatural element is necessary in order to render the assent of the intellect *salutary*, *i.e.*, proportionate to the Beatific Vision; it is not necessary in order to render

the assent of the intellect *possible* to the fact of Revelation. Such an assent, given solely on *account of the motives of credibility*, is according to the Schoolmen, quite possible, apart from any supernatural influence. That is all the Rationalists are entitled to. Such an assent would be, of course, a natural assent. Whether, or how far, it may exist in the concrete, is more than we can determine. If a man did assent *in this manner* exclusively to the fact of Revelation, he would not have supernatural faith.

Another point of some interest is the *formal motive* of faith, or the *precise reason why* the intellect gives its assent. All theologians are agreed that the *formal motive* of faith is not (1) the light of faith, nor (2) the *magisterium* of the Church, which is the *Rule* by which we know *what* to believe, but that it is the "Authority of God incapable of deceiving or of being deceived." There is, however, some divergence of opinion as to whether *Revelation itself* enters in the formal motive as a partial element. The great Schoolmen, Al. Hales, B. Albert the Great, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and others did not admit it. At a later period Suarez, Valentia, Vasquez, Lorca and others held that Revelation is an essential element of the formal motive. They were combated chiefly by the Scotists, such as Smising, Dicastillo, Frassen, Herinx and others, whom we unhesitatingly follow. Some practical consequences flow from this opinion which became in the course of time almost exclusively Scotistic, as we shall see in the sequel. The older Scholastics distinguished between "*veritas Dei in essendo*," "*veritas in cognoscendo*," and "*veritas in loquendo*." The second was assigned as the *formal motive* of the assent of faith. We now come to a very important question, as to which there has been, in our opinion, a considerable amount of misunderstanding concerning the teaching of the Schoolmen, especially of St. Thomas and John Duns Scotus. It is whether the assent of faith is compatible with natural intellectual assent given to its *formal motive* on account of a scientific demonstration. If we are to hold that they are incompatible, we find ourselves face to face with insoluble difficulties, and it is for this reason chiefly that many theologians have got, it seems to us, into hopeless confusion on the subject. Let us turn for light to the great Schoolmen. In matters not requiring

inductive research they are simply past masters. That Alexander Hales and B. Albert the Great held the compatibility of scientific knowledge of God's existence and veracity is undeniable. So did Richard Middleton, Durandus, and the celebrated Dominican, Peter of Tarant, who says : "*Scientia viæ de divinis propter admixtam obscuritatem ex improportione intellectus nostri ad objectum et frequentem obnubilationem phantasmatum non excludit fidem.*"

St. Bonaventure is equally, if not more emphatic. In L. III. Sent. Dist. 24. a. 2. q. 3, he lays down the proposition : "*Scientia apertæ comprehensionis non compatitur secum fidem, sed scientia quæ est a manuactione ratiocinationis simul stat cum fide, ita ut fides sit principale et scientia subserviens.*" By "*scientia apertæ comprehensionis*" St. Bonaventure means the knowledge of God in the Beatific Vision. This knowledge he holds to be incompatible with faith. He does not distinguish expressly between science *a priori* and science *a posteriori*. He upholds expressly *only* the compatibility between faith and the science *a posteriori*.* The distinction is not unimportant,

* It may be as well to give the passage in full from St. Bonaventure, as many may not have his works at hand : "*Respondeo : Ad prædictorum intelligentiam est notandum, quod duplex est cognitio, scilicet apertæ comprehensionis et manuactione ratiocinationis. Si loquamur de scientia apertæ comprehensionis, quo modo cognoscitur Deus in patria ; sic non compatitur secum fidem, ut simul idem sit scitum et creditum, pro eo quod talis cognitio simpliciter excludit ænigma ; et hoc melius apparebit infra, cum agatur de evacuatione virtutum, quare videlicet et qualiter fidei actus per visionem excludatur et evacuetur. Et de hac scientia Sanctorum auctoritates dicunt, et communis opinio magistrorum tenet, hoc esse verum, quod idem non potest esse simul scitum et creditum. Si autem loquamur de scientia, quæ est a manuactione ratiocinationis, sic voluerunt quidam dicere, adhuc esse verum, quod non potest simul stare cum fide, quia per talem scientiam assentit intellectus ipsi rei cognitæ propter ipsam rationem principaliter, assentit etiam necessario, assentit etiam sicut rei, quæ est infra se ; cujus contrarium reperitur in fide, quæ assentit primæ Veritati propter se et voluntarie, elevando rationem super se. Et ideo dixerunt, habitum fidei et scientiæ mutuo sese excludere, secundum quod caritas illum amorem excludit, quo quis amat Deum propter temporalia principaliter. Aliorum vero positio est, quod de uno et eodem simul potest haberi scientia manuactione ratiocinationis cum habitu fidei, juxta quod dicit Augustinus decimo quarto de Trinitate, exponens illud Apostoli : Alii datur per Spiritum sermo sapientiæ, alii sermo scientiæ : Huic scientiæ tribuo illud quo fides saluberrima, quæ ad veram beatitudinem ducit, gignitur, nutritur, defenditur, roboratur ; qua scientia non pollent plurimi fideles, licet habeant fidem.*" Et Richardus de sancto Victore dicit, quod '*ad ea quæ fidei sunt, non tantum possunt haberi rationes probabiles, sed etiam necessariae, licet eas interdum contingat nos latere.*' Unde aliquis credens, Deum esse unum, creatorem omnium, si ex rationibus necessariis incipiat ipsum idem nosse, non propter hoc desinit fidem habere ; vel si etiam prius nosset, fides superveniens talem cognitionem non expelleret, sicut per experientiam patet."

especially in view of the teaching of Scotus, as we shall presently see.

Duns Scotus is frequently quoted as opposed to St. Bonaventure on this point. In point of fact, however, in L. III. Sent. Dist. 24, Quæst. unica, Scotus is treating two totally different points. He proves that faith and *scientia a priori* (and he actually mentions *mathematical* science) are incompatible. This is the explanation given by the Scotists almost to a man. Again, towards the end of this question where he is proving that faith does not involve, or lead to, science strictly so-called, he says: "Et quamvis aliquis posset forte demonstrare, Deum non posse falli nec fallere, quia potest probari, naturaliter, sicut potest probari Deum esse, non tamen protest sciri, nec probari ab aliquo quod Deus dederit nobis lumen supernaturale," &c. Scotus falls back in order to prove his point, not on the incompatibility of faith with the proof of the Divine veracity, but on the impossibility of proving *scientifically* that God has granted us *supernatural light*. That must always remain the object of belief, and belief alone, even if we take, not only the concrete case, but the general principle that supernatural light is granted. There are many other passages justifying the interpretation commonly given by the Scotists of their master's teaching.

St. Thomas is still more extensively quoted than Duns Scotus as holding strongly and unmistakably the incompatibility between the assent of faith and the natural assent given to the demonstration of the existence of God. It is unnecessary to give the passages quoted in support of this interpretation of the Angelic Doctor's teaching. Are they not found in many theological manuals? We do not admit that this is the true interpretation of his teaching. We are profoundly convinced that the distinction which we applied to the teaching of Scotus is also applicable to that of St. Thomas in respect of a great many passages, and, in regard to other passages, we believe that he is to be explained as denying the compatibility of faith and assent given to the demonstration of God's existence "*secundum idem*." St. Thomas meant that the assent of faith is given in a different manner, from a different motive (the natural assent resting on the veracity of *reason*, the superna-

tural on the veracity of *God*), and with a different co-operation on the part of God. We say this in order to clear St. Thomas of the charge of contradicting himself. Let us now see whether St. Thomas supports our view.

In the II. II. of the Summa Theol. Quæst. II. a. X., replying to an objection, he says :

Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod Gregorius loquitur de casu illo quando homo non habet voluntatem credendi ea quæ sunt fidei, *nisi propter rationem inductam* [the italics are ours]; quando autem homo habet voluntatem credendi ea que sunt fidei ex sola auctoritate Divina, etiamsi habeat rationem demonstrativam ad aliquid eorum, puta ad hoc quod est Deum esse, non propter hoc tollitur vel diminuitur meritum fidei.

But there is a more decisive passage still in the II. II. S. T. quæst. V. a I., where he discusses the questions as to whether the Angels and Adam had faith in the state of probation. He says : (in corp.)

Respondeo dicendum quod *quidam* dicunt quod in Angelis ante confirmationem et lapsum et in homine ante peccatum non fuit fides propter manifestam contemplationem quæ tunc erat de rebus divinis; sed cum fides sit *argumentum non apparentium*, sec. Apost. (Heb. 11), et per fidem creduntur ea quæ non videntur, ut Aug. dicit illa sola manifestatio excludit fidei rationem, per quam redditur apparens vel visum *id de quo principaliter est fides* [the italics are ours] principale autem objectum fidei est veritas prima, cujus visio beatos facit et fidei succedit; cum ergo angelus ante confirmationem et homo ante peccatum non habuerit illam beatitudinem, qua Deus per essentiam videtur, manifestum est quod non habuit sic manifestam cognitionem, quod excluderetur ratio fidei. Unde quod non habuerit fidem, hoc esse non potuit, nisi quia penitus ei esset ignotum id de quo est fides; et si homo aut angelus fuerunt creati in puris naturalibus, ut *quidam* dicunt, forte posset teneri, quod fides non fuerit in angelo ante confirmationem, nec in homine ante peccatum, cognitio enim fidei est supra naturalem cognitionem de Deo non solum hominis sed etiam angeli, &c.

Here then we have St. Thomas teaching that the only manifestation of God which is incompatible with faith is that which is effected by the Light of Glory. Faith is compatible with the highest knowledge that even an Angel can have of God in the natural order. The teaching of the Angelic Doctor is even more emphatic than that of the Seraphic.

Thus we have all the great schoolmen brought into line on

this important question. There is no difficulty as to the man who has proven to demonstration the existence and veracity of God in respect of his giving a supernatural assent to the same truths helped by the light of faith and having his will aided by grace. There is no difficulty concerning any theological student who succeeds in demonstrating to himself and to others the things of faith which are demonstrable.

We see the necessity of faith *pro sapientibus et insipientibus*. In the case of the former it renders their knowledge of God more perfect and supernatural; in the case of the latter it supplies the place of demonstration and goes beyond it. How wonderful are the ways of God! The poor and lowly have not to wait until they can master the demonstration of God's existence: "Non in dialecticâ complacuit Deo. saluum facere populum suum." On the other hand, faith is compatible with the greatest intellectual ability the world has ever seen.

As to the compatibility of faith with *a priori* science, we incline to the view of Duns Scotus. The question is not very important.

There is also a question treated in the schools as to the compatibility of faith not only with evidence of its formal motive, but with evidence of the *fact* of Revelation *at the same time*. Many of the schoolmen, especially the Scotists, hold that there is no incompatibility (see Smising, Dicastillo, Herinx and others). The famous Irish Scotist, John Punch, O.S.F., sides with de Lugo against the majority of his own school. On this and on many other questions we venture to differ from Fr. John Punch. The question, as far as *we* are concerned, is purely speculative. We bring it forward to show how carefully the Schoolmen analysed these intricate questions. St. Bonaventure agrees with Scotus and his followers that even the *obscurity* of the material object of faith does not belong to its *formal motive* as an *essential* part, but is its *concomitant condition*. It is certainly a condition that will not be taken from us, as the *fact* of Revelation is not self-evident, and as Revelation contains, *de facto*, a number of truths, which, though evidently credible, are not intrinsically evident.

The next point to be considered is that the *formal motive* of the assent of faith is the same for all the revealed truths. Hence formal heretics, by deliberately rejecting even one truth,

indubitably destroy all faith of a supernatural character. It is different with material heretics. Let us suppose that they are validly baptised in infancy. If so, they receive faith, hope, and charity—the infused theological virtues. When they come to the use of reason, the light of faith, as long as they are in invincible ignorance, co-operates with their assent to the whatever revealed *truths* they admit. It never does, or can, co-operate with the assent they give to *false* doctrine. It is true that they do not acknowledge the divine authority of the Church, but the divine authority of the Church is only the *Rule* of faith and not its *formal motive*. When they become Catholics it is not correct to say that they receive the faith for the first time. They accept the *Rule* of faith, and receive an extension of the material object. Their faith is also, as a rule, rendered more perfect and intense.

Let us now take the case of the unbaptised—pagans of every description. We know that God seriously wishes the salvation of all men, and consequently that He offers to all the means of salvation. But “without faith, it is impossible to please God.” How can they have faith? We must bear in mind that they can, absolutely speaking, arrive at the knowledge of God by the intrinsic power of reason, given the normal physiological conditions, by exterior aids and internal inspiration. We must not lose sight of the fact that they live and move and have their being in God, that He co-operates immediately and effectively with their every intellectual act. In the supposition that they have no knowledge of *external* revelation, it is not impossible for them to have faith, as it does not belong to the *formal motive* of faith. This St. Thomas undeniably holds in regard to the faith of our first parents: “Ad tertium dicendum quod in statu primæ conditionis non erat auditus ab homine exterius loquente, sed a Deo interius inspirante.” He holds the same doctrine in common with nearly all the Schoolmen in regard to those who have no knowledge of Christian revelation. They are certainly bound to give supernatural assent explicitly to two truths, viz., that God is and that He is a rewarder to them that seek Him. The proposition: “Nonnisi Fides unius Dei necessaria videtur necessitate medii, non autem explicita Remuneratoris”

was condemned by Innocent XI., as also the following: "Fides late dicta, ex testimonio creaturarum similive motivo, ad justificationem sufficit." They must give *supernatural* assent to those two truths at least; then comes the baptism of desire if they faithfully co-operate with grace, and consequently justification.

Another question of some interest is that concerning the necessity of belief, explicit or implicit, in the Blessed Trinity and in the Incarnation. St. Alphonso, writing on the question, says that the opinion of those who hold the necessity for all of explicit belief in the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation from the time of the propagation of the Gospel is *communior et videtur probabilior*. This opinion does not commend itself to us. The great Schoolmen did not distinguish with anything like precision between *de necessitate medii* and *de necessitate præcepti*, nor did they distinguish between the pagans who lived during the Old Covenant and those who live during the New. St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure are in perfect accord on this question. When they speak of the *necessity* of *explicit* belief in the Incarnation, the natural interpretation is that they are speaking of *Christians*. St. Thomas says, II. II. q. 2, a. 7, ad 3: "Si qui tamen salvati fuerunt quibus revelatio non fuit facta, non fuerunt salvati absque fide mediatoris, quia etsi non habuerunt fidem explicitam, habuerunt tamen fidem implicitam in divina providentia credentes Deum esse liberatorem hominum secundum modos sibi placitos, &c." St. Bonaventure (in L. III. Sent. Dist. 25 a. 1, q. 2) says: "Nullus post lapsum salvari potuit absque mediatoris fide saltem implicita." The Seraphic Doctor makes no distinction between those who lived before and after the promulgation of the Gospel. There is, however, a very strange divergence of opinion between himself and the Angelic Doctor as to the belief in the Incarnation *before* the fall. St. Bonaventure follows *some* of the ancient Scholastics in refusing to admit an explicit belief in the Incarnation before the fall, whereas St. Thomas, following Alexander Hales and B. Albert the Great, holds that our first parents had explicit belief in it before they fell. Here are St. Thomas's own words, II. II. Quæst. II. a. T. in corp. :

Nam ante statum peccati homo habuit explicitam fidem in Christi Incarnationem secundum quod ordinabatur ad consummationem gloriæ non autem secundum quod ordinabatur ad liberationem a peccato per passionem et resurrectionem, quia homo non fuit præsciens peccati futuri. Videtur autem Incarnationis Christi præsciens fuisse per hoc quod dixit: *Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem et adhærebit uxori suæ*, ut habetur, Gen. 2, et hoc Apost. ad Eph. 5 dicit: *Sacramentum magnum esse in Christo et in Ecclesia*, quod quidem Sacramentum non est credibile primum hominem ignorasse.

This accords with the doctrine put forward subsequently with so much *éclat* by Duns Scotus. What renders this more extraordinary still is the fact that in his Comm. on the Sentences (L. III. Dist. 25. Quæst. 2, a. 2, quæstunc. 2) he follows St. Bonaventure, and in III. part of his Summa T. he seems to revert to his former opinion, though he writes on the question with great moderation. Of course the III. part of the Summa has not the same authority, for a well-known reason, as the rest. This is what he says (III. p. q. 1, a. 3 in corp.):

Respondeo dicendum quod aliqui circa hoc *diversimode* opinantur: *quidam* enim dicunt, quod etiamsi homo non peccasset, Dei Filius incarnatus fuisset: *alii* vero contrarium, quorum assertioni magis assentiendum videtur; ea enim quæ ex sola Dei voluntate proveniunt supra omne debitum creaturæ, nobis innotescere non possunt, nisi quatenus in sacra scriptura traduntur, per quam Divina voluntas nobis innotescit, unde cum in sacra scriptura ubique incarnationis ratio ex peccato primi hominis assignetur, convenientius dicitur, incarnationis opus ordinatum esse a Deo in remedium contra peccatum; ita quod peccato non existente, incarnatio non fuisset: quamvis potentia Dei ad hoc non limitetur: *potuisset* enim, etiam peccato non existente, Deus incarnari.

The only explanation that suggests itself to us of this evident vacillation on the part of St. Thomas is the undeniable fact that in writing the II. part of the Summa T. he was very much under the influence of the writings of the great English Schoolman, Alexander Hales. We do not consider that an *explicit* belief in a *hypothetical* Incarnation, without a knowledge of the condition, could be attributed to our first parents by St. Thomas. The only explanation is that of Scotus and his followers, taken from Alexander Hales and B. Albert the Great, that the decree concerning the Incarnation existed before, and independently of, the Fall, and was made known to Adam. That seems to us to have been in the mind of St.

Thomas when he wrote II. II. q. 2, a. T. However, we gladly leave the question to the judgment of more competent theologians than ourselves.

Reverting to the question of the salvation of pagans, we wish to recall the proposition (5) condemned by Alex. VIII. : "Pagani, Judæi, heretici, alique hujus generis nullum omnino accipiunt a Jesu Christo influxum ; adeoque hinc recte inferes, in illis esse voluntatem nudam et inermem sine omni gratia sufficienti." Some people look upon the visible extent of Christianity as the limit of the influence of Christ. The truth is that there is not one responsible human being who is not influenced by the Incarnate God. We do not mean, of course, to the same degree as those who belong to the true Church, and we must never lose sight of the immensely greater graces which we enjoy, nor of the *necessity* laid upon us to make known to all the way of salvation in all its plenitude and richness. Hence the objection drawn from the restricted sphere of Christianity falls to the ground. Finally, the case of pagans who have no actual knowledge of God, if any such there be, need not disturb us. A theologian for whom we have the greatest possible respect—Cardinal Sfrondati—has treated the whole question in a most satisfactory manner in his noble work, "Nodus Predestinationis," so fiercely attacked by Jansenistic intriguers at that time. Among the forty propositions extracted for censure we find the following (xxxviii.) :

Demus Brasilie populos Deum ita (invincibiliter) ignorasse, id quoque magni beneficii et gratie pars fuit : & xxxix. "Cum (Barbari) hac (Dei) ignorantia impeccabiles redderentur, alioquin certissime peccaturi, si agnoscerent, sequitur, hoc ipsum beneficium esse. Ergo sive Barbari agnoscant (Deum), sicque invocare illum, et salutem consequi possint, sive penitus ignorent, et ideo nec possint peccare, semper verum erit, ne illis quidem misericordiam deesse.

A very able defence of Sfrondati's propositions and a scathing refutation of the censures of the Jansenistic opponents of the learned and pious Cardinal will be found in the "Dispunctio Notarum Quadraginta" sent to Pope Innocent XII. Those propositions were never censured by ecclesiastical authority.

We have now treated the few points we intended to put before the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW. We tried to get at the teaching of the great Schoolmen in order to give some idea of the treasures contained in those dusty folios. We hope and pray that some one may arise who will bring forth those treasures in the widespread English language, correcting and enriching them with the results of inductive science and historical research which have been so marvellously accumulated since their time—*nova et vetera*.

FR. DAVID, O.S.F.

ART. VIII.—MARY TUDOR AND THE REFORMERS.

MARY TUDOR is the *bête noir* of popular Protestant history. No language has been found too strong to depict her as a monster of cruelty and vindictiveness. Even Mr. Gladstone, who ought to have known better, in a moment of irritation, hurled at her the epithet of "Bloody Mary." She is the one dark blot in that brilliant page of the glorious Reformation history which records the lives of "Bluff King Hal," the young saint and Solomon, Edward VI., and that "bright occidental star," the "Good Queen Bess." Such is history when written by partisans. The history of those times is fast passing out of such hands. State papers from various quarters are being published, and their evidence shows the life and personal character of Mary Tudor in a juster and truer light. It tends to clear away the obloquy and dark shades in which writers like the unvarnished Fox have painted the picture of her life, and which they have left as a legacy to succeeding ages. It is time that some attempt should be made to do justice to the memory of this much-injured queen, and to show from history that no woman ever led a sadder life, and one more deserving of our pity and admiration, than Mary Tudor, under the most trying circumstances.

Some of the more fair-minded Protestant historians do not hesitate to confess that the traditional and popular belief about Queen Mary will not stand the light of historical research. Mr. Tytler, for instance, who has published the original letters, of her reign remarks :

There are some points in English History, or rather in English feeling upon English History, which have become part of the natural belief—they may have been hastily or superficially assumed—they may be proved by as good evidence as the case admits of to be erroneous ; but they are fondly clung to, screwed and dovetailed into the mind of the people, and to attack them is a historical heresy. It is with these musings that I approach her who is so generally execrated as the "Bloody Mary." The idea of exciting a feeling in her favour will appear a chimerical, perhaps a blameable one ; yet, having examined the point with some care, let me

say for myself that I believe her to have been naturally rather an amiable person. Indeed, until she was thirty-nine, the time of her marriage with Philip, nothing can be said against her, unless we agree to detest her because she remained faithful to the Roman Catholic Church; nor can there, I think, be any doubt that she has been treated by Fox, Strype, Carte, and other Protestant writers, with injustice. The few unpublished letters of hers which I have met with are simple, unaffected, and kind-hearted; forming in this respect a striking contrast to those of Elizabeth, which are often inflated, obscure and pedantic. The distinguishing epithets by which the two sisters are commonly known, the "Bloody Mary" and the "Good Queen Bess," have evidently a reference to their times; yet we constantly employ them individually.*

Mary Tudor was born at the royal palace at Greenwich, February 18, 1515. The Countess of Salisbury (Margaret Plantagenet) was chosen as her governess, and Catharine, wife of Leonard Pole, as her nurse. The nursery establishment was fixed at Ditton Park in Buckingham, on a scale of great magnificence. Lady Bryan, wife of Sir Thomas Bryan, was lady mistress, and the Countess of Salisbury, Mary's most attached and devoted friend, was State governess. It is not the object of this paper to detail the history of her early life. Those who wish to read it will find it given with much detail and accuracy by her Protestant biographer, Miss Strickland. Her education was watched over with great care by her accomplished and loving mother, under the guidance of the learned Spaniard, Ludovico Vives.† The young princess was directed to read the Gospels, morning and evening, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and selections from the Old and New Testament; the works of Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose; likewise Plato, Cicero, Seneca's Maxims, Plutarch, the Paraphrase of Erasmus and the Utopia of Sir Thomas More, also the Pharsalia of Lucan, the tragedies of Seneca, and selections from Horace. She has to learn the rules for Latin and Greek pronunciation, and is frequently to translate English into Latin, and to converse in Latin with her tutor. By way of recreation she was to read stories, such as the history of Joseph and his brethren, of Papyrus in Aulus Gellius and Lucretia, the well-known tale of Griselda being about the only work of fiction tolerated. Here we have a syllabus of work

* "The Reigns of Edward VI. and Mary," vol. i. p. 49.

† Madden's "Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary," p. cxxi.

that would satisfy the most advanced of our modern emancipated women. The result was that Mary became one of the most learned and accomplished women of her age, but it may be a question whether the severe strain of such a course of study upon one so young did not lay the foundation for that melancholy and earnest temperament and broken health which had so much to do with the character of her after reign.

With the question of the divorce, Mary's early troubles began. She was separated from her mother, whom she was never allowed to see again, not even to receive a last blessing on her death-bed. She was deprived of the society of her tried friend the Countess of Salisbury, and was made to occupy the position of a menial in the household of Anne Boleyn, who treated her with the harshness of the proverbial stepmother, so much so that when the unhappy queen came to die, her conscience was sorely troubled on this point, for the night before her execution she knelt down before Lady Kingsdon, and begged of her to go to Hunsden, where Mary resided, and on her knees and in her name to beg pardon for the indignities she had inflicted upon the defenceless girl. On the accession of Edward VI., her troubles which had ceased for a time began again. The sour and rabid fanatics who surrounded the throne determined to make her conform to the new religion. One of her chaplains, Mallet, was imprisoned. The comptroller of her household, Rochester, was also imprisoned. In fact, nothing short of a threat on the part of the Emperor Charles V., that he would declare war upon England if his royal cousin was further molested on account of her religion, secured Mary from further persecution. Bitter must have been her recollections of the suffering she had to endure at the hands of the Reformers, whose conduct gave them small claim upon her consideration and clemency when her turn came to exercise the supreme power of the State. Before Edward's death Mary had become a chronic invalid, suffering periodically from long and protracted attacks of hysteria and other female complaints, the result of broken health consequent upon the mental and bodily suffering of her early life. The Reformers took advantage of this to give out as a reason for depriving Mary of the succession that she was "a poor miserable invalid, fit for nothing but to be shut up in her

palace." They proceeded to take steps to give effect to their opposition by persuading Edward VI. to disinherit both his sisters in favour of Lady Jane Grey, a professed Protestant. This was an act of high treason by the statute law of England. Edward VI. expired at Greenwich, July 6, 1553. A delusive message was sent to Mary summoning her to her brother's death-bed with the view of seizing her person and committing her to the Tower. She was warned probably by Lord Arundel or Sir Nicholas Throckmorton and fled to Framlingham Castle, where she raised the royal standard. She was joined by Sir Henry Jerningham, Sir Henry Bedingfeld, and other good old Catholic families, and soon found herself at the head of a large army of 30,000 men. Mary had written to the Council commanding them, as they hoped for favour, to proclaim her as queen. She was answered by an insolent message declaring her illegitimate. The attempted opposition failed. Mary's enemies were at her feet, steeped to the lips in high treason, and had she chosen to inflict summary punishment upon them, the whole country was ready to say she had done quite right. Northumberland, Suffolk, and other supporters of Lady Jane Grey had been taken with arms in their hands and sent to the Tower. Crammer's name was the first on the list of councillors who had proclaimed Mary's deposition. He had aggravated his guilt by publishing an intemperate proclamation tending to disturb public order. He was sent for by Mary's Council who, "after a long and serious debate, committed him to the Tower, as well for the treason committed by him against the queen's highness, as for aggravating the same his offence by spreading abroad seditious bills and moving tumults to the disquietness of the present State." Latimer was also sent to the Tower "for his seditious demeanour."* Ridley had publicly preached against the queen's succession at St. Paul's Cross by order of Edward's Council and was sent to the Tower; also Sandys, who had done the same thing at Cambridge. Now, what was Mary to do with these men? Had she imitated the example of the two previous reigns, or followed the advice of her Council, she would have made short work of them. Mary was obliged to form her Council partly

* Journal of Council, in *Archæol.* xviii. 175 ; Haynes, i. 183, 184.

from the late Council, who had gone over to her side, and partly from the country gentlemen who had supported her.

As the leading members of Mary's Council had nearly all of them one time or other sided against her, she felt she could not trust them till she had had further experience of them. She therefore applied for advice to her relation the Emperor Charles V. as to what she was to do with her State prisoners. He replied that rebellion must not go unpunished, but that justice must be tempered with mercy. Twenty-seven names of the leading rebels were presented to her for trial. With her own hand she struck out the names of sixteen prisoners, amongst them Bishops Ridley of London, and Thirlby of Ely. Of the remainder only three, Northumberland, Sir Thomas Palmer, and Sir John Gates, were put to death, an act of clemency unheard of in those days, and which her advisers blamed as a political blunder. Nothing could induce her to listen to the demand of the imperial ambassador for the trial of Lady Jane Grey. She replied to them (Renard's "Despatches," edited by Giffet, xi.) that "she could not find it in her heart or conscience to put her unfortunate kinswoman to death, who had not been an accomplice of Northumberland, but merely an unresisting instrument in his hands. . . . As for the danger existing from her pretensions, it was only imaginary, and every requisite precaution should be taken before she was set at liberty."

One of Mary's first acts was to issue two proclamations, which drew upon her the blessings of the whole country. One was to restore the depreciated coinage, which had been so debased in the previous reigns that a shilling was worth only about $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ The other, to remit a subsidy of 4s. in the pound on land and 2s. 8d. on goods, which had been granted in the last reign. She also liberated the Duke of Norfolk and other State prisoners, and restored their estates which had been unjustly forfeited to the Crown in the previous reigns, and which were worth some £60,000 a year. Considering the bankrupt state of the royal exchequer, these were acts of unprecedented generosity. Mary also published a proclamation (given by Wilkins, "Con." iv. 84) regarding religion, in which she declared that she had "no intention to compel any one to embrace her religion, till further order was taken by common consent ;

and, therefore, she strictly forbade all persons to excite sedition amongst the people, or to foment discussions by using the opprobrious terms of heretic or papist." On October 1st Mary was crowned, and four days afterwards opened her first Parliament. Its first act was to restore the criminal law and property law to the state in which they stood in the 25th Edward III. At one stroke all the hideous legislation by which Henry VIII. was able to gibbet in the latter years of his reign innumerable victims—Holinshed says (*Chron.* vol. i. p. 186) 72,000 persons, an estimate which must be taken as a popular one—was swept away and such scenes rendered impossible again in England. The laws against the queen's legitimacy were also repealed in the second Session; all Cranmer's ecclesiastical legislation was swept away and religion restored as it was in the last year of Henry VIII.'s reign. A Bill of Attainder was passed against Cranmer, Guildford Dudley, Lady Jane Grey, and Ambrose Dudley and others. They were tried at Guildhall and, having pleaded guilty, sentenced to death by Chief Justice Morgan, but it was well understood about the Court that the queen did not intend to have the sentence carried out, but to let their danger stand as a pledge for the good behaviour of the other Reformers.

The queen's marriage next engaged public attention. Friar Payto, who had survived Cromwell's threat of being put into a sack and thrown in the Thames, advised her "Do not marry or you will be the slave of a young husband. Besides, at your age the chance of bringing heirs to the Crown is doubtful, and, moreover, will be dangerous to your life." All parties were opposed to a marriage with a foreigner. Mary, however, had the strong will of her race, and decided to give her hand to Philip of Spain. The announcement of the queen's intention, owing to the intrigues of Noailles, the French Ambassador, the bane of Mary's reign, led to insurrections breaking out in various parts of the country with the view of deposing the queen in favour of the Earl of Courtenay and Princess Elizabeth. The Duke of Suffolk, father of Lady Jane Grey, also joined the conspiracy, probably with a view of reviving his daughter's claim. Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Kentish insurgents were the most formidable. Wyatt penetrated almost to the gates of Whitehall, but the city was saved by the

courage of the queen ; for when she was urged to retire to the Tower she replied "that she would set no example of cowardice ; and if Pembroke and Clinton proved true to their posts, she would not desert hers."* When the battle was raging Mary took her place in the gallery of the gatehouse of the palace, and when Courtenay, who was playing the part of traitor, rushed in to her presence saying all was lost, she replied with infinite disdain, "Such was the fond opinion of those who durst not go near enough to see the truth of the trial," adding, "that she herself would immediately enter the battle and abide the upshot of her rightful quarrel, or die with the brave men then fighting for her, and so she prepared herself accordingly" (Holinshed, p. 1089). On the suppression of the rebellion the prisoners taken in arms were led into the tilt yard at Whitehall ; the queen appeared in the gallery above and pronounced their pardon, and when the Sheriff of Kent reported to her that some of them, in spite of her pardon, were being sent to take their trials, she interfered, saying, "I have pardoned them once, and they shall not be further vexed." Some sixty deserters were executed in different parts of the city for their treason in deserting in face of the enemy. Some half a dozen more were executed in Kent. Most of the prisoners in the Tower, on expressing their regret, were liberated. Only four of the ringleaders were put to death—the Duke of Suffolk, the father of Lady Jane Grey, who had repaid the Queen's mercy in pardoning his treason on the occasion of Northumberland's rebellion by this fresh treason, Wyatt himself, Lord Thomas Grey, and William Thomas. This rebellion, unfortunately, sealed the fate of Lady Jane Grey and Guildford Dudley. They had both been sentenced to death already, but Mary would not hear of its being carried out ; but now both the emperor and her Council represented that this present rebellion was the result of her former clemency, that Lady Jane Grey had again been proclaimed queen by Wyatt's men, that as long as she remained alive there would be no peace in the kingdom, and that reasons of State policy required that the death sentence should be carried out. Yielding to the pressure put upon her, the queen signed the warrant for the execution of Guildford Dudley and his wife.

* Renard MS. iii. 287.

Those who may be disposed to charge Queen Mary with undue severity under these circumstances would do well to compare her conduct with that of the good Queen Bess under similar circumstances.* About this time Queen Mary wrote to Cardinal Pole to ask his advice how to proceed with regard to the vacant bishoprics, and asking whether he had authority to issue a decree of confirmation (Tytler, ii. p. 303), for that neither she herself or any of those nominated for bishops were willing to proceed without the Pope's authority in a canonical manner (Quirini, iv. p. 127). Not receiving any answer, the queen wrote again on January 28. Pole in reply sent over Dr. Goldwell, afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph's, "with a commission to expounde to her highness his hole mynde and sentence" on this subject, but he does not explain it in writing (Strype's "Memories of Cranmer," Appendix No. lxxv.). Goldwell's instructions are printed in Strype as if they were all given at one and the same time, whereas this was the third occasion on which Goldwell had come over to England with instructions. These instructions seem to have put matters in the proper track. A commission was appointed, consisting of the bishops of Winchester, London, Chichester, and Durham, to try the cases of the seven Anglican prelates who had obtained possession of sees during the previous reign. On March 20, 1554, Taylor, Hooper, and Harlowe were deprived of their sees on account of *nullity* of consecration (Pocock's "Burnet," ii. p. 441), and the other four on the ground either of intrusion, marriage, and other canonical reasons. Pole then, on receiving letters from the seven Catholic bishops selected to fill the sees vacated by the deprivation of the seven Anglican prelates, sent over letters of absolution, dispensation, and confirmation. On the 7th of April the queen addressed a letter to the Pope with her own hand (Quirini, iv. p. 159), asking him to approve of what his legate had done, and in full consistory on the 6th of July, Pope Julius III. preconized the seven new bishops in the usual form, and on the 10th wrote to the queen to congratulate her on the choice she had made of bishops, and on her "proposing them for the confirmation of

* After the abortive Northern Rebellion (1570) some eight hundred people were hanged, and Elizabeth reprimanded her generals for not "executing justice more promptly."

the Apostolic See, according to the usual Catholic custom" (Raynaldus, xiv. p. 257-8). It is well, just now, to insist on this fact, because our Anglican friends are much given to saying that Mary acted in this matter entirely on the strength of the royal supremacy, and without having received any authority from the Holy See. On the 25th of July, 1554, Mary was married with great pomp to Philip at Winchester, and on the 30th of November following Cardinal Pole reconciled England to the Holy See.

This was followed by an Act of Grace. The Lord Chancellor and several of the councillors proceeded to the Tower, called before them the prisoners still confined there on account of the attempts of Northumberland and Wyatt, and informed them that at the intercession of the emperor, the king and queen had ordered them to be released (Lingard, v. p. 225).

The attitude of the Reformers towards the queen's government continued to be so seditious and threatening, after Wyatt's rebellion, that soon after her marriage the Council frequently debated what course had best be adopted to prevent any further disturbance of the public peace. The Reform party had hitherto been treated with a gentleness which for those times was unprecedented, but as forbearance had failed to conciliate them and only seemed to increase their audacity, the Council evidently thought that it was time to adopt more stringent measures in the interest of public order. Their final resolution was not made known to the queen till November, and Mary returned the following answer in writing :

Touching the punishment of heretics, we thinketh it ought to be done without rashness, not leaving in the meantime to do justice to such as by learning would seem to deceive the simple ; and the rest so to be used that the people may well perceive them not to be condemned without just occasion ; by which they shall both understand the truth, and beware not to do the like (Lingard, v. p. 229).

A number of the reformed preachers were already in prison, some as accomplices in Northumberland's and Wyatt's rebellion, others for preaching without a license, and some for disorderly and seditious sermons in which they incited the people to open revolt. Amongst these were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Rogers, Saunders, and Taylor. When Mary's

third Parliament met, it was proposed to revise the three statutes passed against the Lollards, under Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V. An Act was introduced for this purpose. It was considered so necessary to act firmly under the circumstances with the turbulent and seditious party of fanatics who make the cloak of religion only an excuse for disloyalty, that every voice was in its favour, and in four days it passed both Houses of Parliament. On January 16, 1555, Mary dissolved her third Parliament and gave her assent to its Acts. She had been taken seriously ill in the previous November, and she continued so unwell that she had to be carried to her throne in the House of Lords when she dissolved Parliament on January 16. We read in "*Machyn's Diary*" (p. 84) that "on April 3 the king's grace removed the queen to Hampton Court to keep Easter and to take her chamber there," as was usual when an heir to the throne was expected. But Mary's illness was not owing to her approaching confinement, but it proved to be dropsy, which told of the complete break up of her constitution and made her quite incapable of attending to public business. Michele, the Venetian Ambassador, writes home to the Senate to say :

From the time of her first affliction she was a prey to the severest headaches, her head being frightfully swelled; she was likewise subject to perpetual attacks of hysteria, which other women exhale by tears and piercing cries (MS. Lansdowne, p. 840, A. fol. 157, British Museum).

Michele also adds: "Sometimes she lay for weeks without speaking, as one dead, and more than once the rumour went out that she had died in childbed."

So general was this knowledge of her state, that the King of France instructed his ambassador to go down to Hampton Court and to try to see the queen, "watching her countenance all the time." Noailles went to Hampton Court in May, but the queen was too ill to receive him, and he writes to his king to say :

That the queen would never bring any child into the world; and that the wise woman and the old maid who had attended her from her youth had declared that the queen's supposed state was by no means of a hopeful kind generally supposed, but rather some woeful malady, for she sat

whole days on the ground crouched together with her knees higher than her head (Noailles' "Ambassades," v. p. 26, 27).

In the following September we find Mary somewhat better. An Irish physician had diagnosed her complaint correctly, and had been able to give her some relief. For a few days she tried to attend to public business, but her health again gave way, and she was never seen again at the council board. "The queen herself never came to the Council, and the cardinal very seldom; sometimes there were very few that attended that board; often not above three or four" ("Burnet," iii. p. 440, ed. 1865).

Mary's Protestant biographer, Miss Strickland, remarks:

With her married life the independence of her reign ceased; from whatever cause, either owing to her desperate state of health, or from her idea of wifely duty, Philip, whether absent or present, guided the English Government. . . . Philip gave his commands and wrote his mind with no more recognition of his wife's authority than was observed by Henry VII. to Elizabeth of York. When he left England, the queen desired Cardinal Pole to make minutes of the king's last injunctions for the Privy Council, and they are still preserved in his handwriting. . . . These documents afford incontestable proof that Philip of Spain not Mary of England was the reigning sovereign of England. If this had not been the case, how could the truthful Fuller, the historian of our Church, who lived too near the times of Queen Mary to be deceived, thus speak of her? "She had been a worthy princess if as little cruelty was done under her as by her. She hated to equivocate, and always was what she was without dissembling her judgment or conduct for fear or flattery."*

Mr. Tytler (ii. p. 481), one of the very best authorities on the history of this period, also remarks to the same effect: "It has been observed by Sir James Macintosh, that Philip, when the prospect of having children by Mary became visionary, hastened to quit England and afterwards 'disregarded the affairs of a turbulent people, upon whom he had no hold but the slight thread of a hypochondriacal woman'" ("Hist. of Eng.," ii. p. 335). Here this eloquent writer has been led into error. Although Philip quitted England, he constantly corresponded with the Privy Council, received long despatches from them, and replied to them at equal length. No affair of any public importance was determined without

* Strickland, ii. p. 645.

his being consulted. The minutes of the meetings of the Privy Council were translated into Latin and transmitted to him at Brussels. These he seems to have read with much attention. Having made his remarks likewise in Latin, he sent them back to the Council, and they remain in the State Paper Office, with the king's notes in the margin. Instead, therefore, of disregarding the affairs of England, he continued, though absent, to take an active interest and exercised a controlling influence upon public affairs. There is in the State Paper Office a minute of the Council, dated Sept. 1533, with Philip's remarks upon it, which show how entirely he had taken the control of public affairs into his own hands. He writes to say :

It appears to the king that all these matters ought to be treated by a Council of eight select councillors; and when they have canvassed the matter, they should then inform the king's Majesty, who will communicate his decision to them. And as his Majesty for his earnest love to the kingdom of England is anxious that all things which concern its welfare should conveniently be provided for, he desires also that nothing should be proposed in Parliament without its having been first communicated to his Majesty, in order that he may signify his opinion, when the time fixed for the convocation of Parliament permits it (Tytler, p. 484).

This shows how completely Mary had disappeared from public, and how completely she was, owing to her desperate fits of illness, obliged to leave the control of public affairs in the hands of Philip and her Council, and it may be well doubted if she was allowed even to know what was being done in her name. There can be no doubt that the warrants for the trial and execution of Protestants were issued and executed by the Council without the royal signature being obtained.

Who then is to be held responsible for those severe measures, taken during the last three years of her reign, which have led posterity to style her "Bloody Mary."

What kindled and fanned the flames of Smithfield? What raised and kept alive the Popish persecution in the days of Queen Mary? Was it her own sanguinary disposition? or was she the slave of her husband's cruel superstition? or were both the tools of foreigners, who certainly hated the English because they were heretics, but more deadly the heretics because they were Englishmen? Was it "Wily

Winchester"? or was it "Bloody Bonner"? or was it something in the spirit of the Church of which both were zealous members?

Maitland, who asks these questions ("Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England," p. 41), answers them as follows :

Whatever may be said on any or on all of these points, there was undoubtedly one other cause, which, if it be too much to say that it has been studiously concealed or disguised, has certainly never occupied that prominent place to which it is entitled in such an inquiry. I mean the bitter and provoking spirit of some of those who were very active and forward in promoting the progress of the Reformation ; the political opinions they held and the language in which they disseminated them ; the fierce personal attacks which they made on those they considered their enemies ; and to say the least, the little care which was taken by those who were really actuated by religious motives and seeking a true reformation of the Church to shake off a *lewd, ungodly, profane rabble*, who joined the cause of Protestantism, thinking in their depraved imaginations or hoping to make it by their wicked devices the cause of liberty against law, of the poor against the rich, of the laity against the clergy, of the people against their rulers. In particular it seems impossible that any reflecting mind, even misled by partial relations or prejudiced by doctrinal opinions, should fail to see as a mere matter of fact in how great a degree the persecution of Protestants in England was caused by the conduct of their brethren in exile.

It was the conduct of this lewd, ungodly, profane rabble that forced the Government to adopt severe measures for their repression. As a party, the Reformers traded not only in sedition, but in high treason. They had twice risen in armed rebellion in order to depose the queen. They were continually hatching fresh plots against the Government and even against the queen's life. They were flooding the country with scurrilous and dangerous literature, inciting the people not only to depose the queen, but to kill her. What could the Government do in the face of such circumstances? What would our present Government do, supposing any body of socialists or anarchists were to make similar attempts not only against the Government, but against the life of the present queen? No Government worthy of the name could hesitate for a moment to adopt measures of stern repression in dealing with such men. It would be a libel on the Council to accuse them as a body of being actuated by any zeal for the Roman Catholic religion.

The principal calamities of Mary's life were inflicted by the anti-Papal Catholics, who were at this era greatly superior in numbers and political power to either of the others (Protestant or Catholic). From their ranks had been drawn the rigorous ministry that aided Henry VIII. in his long course of despotic cruelty, his rapacity, his bigamies and his religious persecutions. The survivors of this junta were now the ministers of Queen Mary. Renard, the Imperial Ambassador, writes to the emperor, March 22, 1553, to say that the number of councillors was the cause of great confusion, and that the only remedy for this was the limitation of that body to five or six.

Upon this subject [he says] that Paget, Petre and himself had conferred together at the queen's request. The other councillors and nobles, the Admiral, Pembroke, Derby, Shrewsbury, Sussex, and the rest were to be allowed to attend when they were at Court, but not after the close of Parliament. They were to be employed in distant parts of the realm; whilst the Chancellor,* Arundel, the Bishop of Norwich, Paget, the Comptroller,† and Petre were to be entrusted with the affairs of the State.

He states, at the same time, that Gardiner's party was the weaker and unable to stand against his opponents (Tytler, ii. p. 346). Gardiner, with Thirlby, Bishop of Norwich, and Rochester, represented the Catholic party. Paget, with Arundel and Petre, represented the anti-Papal party.

Renard writes again, May 25, 1554, to say :

The parties which divide the Council are so many, and their disputes so public, they are so banded the one against the other, that they forget the service of the queen to think of their private passions and quarrels. Nothing is done but by the Queen's express orders. Paget with the heretics is leagued against the Chancellor and the Catholics (Tytler, p. 399).

He writes also, May 1, 1554 : " It is true that I have observed Paget to hold constant intercourse with heretics " (Tytler, ii. p. 386). Paget, owing to his Protestant leanings, had opposed the Bills in Parliament for the punishment of heretics, and the statute which made it a capital offence to take arms against Philip of Spain. Renard writes, May 13, 1554, that

Paget, stung with remorse, has lately presented himself to the queen after her mass, and asked her mercy for his intrigues in the late Parlia-

* Gardiner.

† Sir R. Rochester.

ment. . . . After some remonstrance the queen pardoned him, recommending him to behave better in time to come. As soon as the Chancellor and his party were aware of such a mode of proceeding, they began to suspect that some plot was in hand against the queen between Paget, Arundel, Pembroke, Cobham, and other noble heretics ; and that to conceal it the better, Paget had adopted this course (Tytler, ii. p. 393).

As Gardiner was absent on an embassy in France, and died soon after his return, Paget and his party were able to control the Council. He was secretary under Henry VIII., councillor under Edward VI., Mary and Elizabeth.* Arundel was another politician of the same stamp, and so was Petre, who had been one of Henry VIII.'s visitors for the suppression of the monasteries. They were turncoats with every change of the political weathercock, and traitors to every cause. They had, moreover, learnt their political principles at the feet of Henry VIII., Cranmer, and the Protector Somerset, to whom Calvin writes for his guidance when dealing with Catholics in a letter, translated by Cranmer, to say :

As I understand, you have two kinds of mutineers against the king and the estates of the realm : the one are a fantastical people who, under colour of the Gospel, would set all to confusion ; the others are stubborn people in the superstition of the Antichrist of Rome. These altogether do deserve to be well punished by a sword, seeing they do conspire against the king and against God, who hath set him in the royal seat. Of all things let there be no moderation. It is the bane of genuine improvement (MSS. Edward VI. vol. v., 1548).

The chief agents in the Protestant persecution were themselves crypto-Protestants, who, under Edward VI., had helped to establish Protestantism, and who, under Elizabeth, helped to pull down the Church they had set up under Queen Mary. They were merely politicians dealing with a political crisis. They were shrewd enough to take in the situation, and to trim their sails accordingly. The Catholics formed nine-tenths of the people. They

saw everything which to them was most precious and hallowed, and which had come down to them with the sanction and traditions of more than a thousand years, insulted and trampled under foot by men whose language proved them to be bad subjects of the Crown, as well as their

* He was, under Edward VI., deprived of his office of secretary for peculation in 1552, and degraded from the Order of the Garter (Tytler, ii. 107).

lives showed them to be bad champions of religion. Men had seen the horrible excesses which some of these so-called Reformers, such as Thomas Muncer, and John Boccold of Leyden, the Anabaptist leaders at Munster, and Theodore the Adamite at Amsterdam had committed, and it was not strange if they thought that the only way was to deal with the peril as we did with the Sepoy Mutiny and with the cattle plague (Littledale's "Innovations," p. 18).

In order to judge fairly of the doings of these times, it is absolutely necessary to bear in mind that neither Queen Mary or any of her contemporaries knew anything about the modern principle of religious toleration. Protestant and Catholic alike regarded heresy as a soul destroying evil. They held that individuals had no more right to spread abroad amongst the people what they considered spiritual murder than they had to spread the plague of the Black Death, and that it was the duty of the State to prevent them from doing so by every means in its power.

Moreover, men had not yet learned to distinguish between religion and politics. The Reformers of Mary's time looked upon it as their first duty to pull down the Government of the ungodly as the great hindrance to the spread of the Gospel, and the Government of the ungodly, on the other hand, naturally defended itself from such attacks by every means in its power. If men chose to make religion only another name for political intrigue, sedition and high treason, they must not complain if they suffer the penalties of the law of high treason, which is the same now as it was then. Such practices are not put down with rose water at any time, especially in Tudor times. The popular notion that the Reformers were good, holy men, who spent their time in saying their prayers and expounding the Bible, is ludicrously unhistorical. They were nothing of the kind. They were, as a rule, pronounced revolutionists, and many of them bloodthirsty fanatics, whose trust was in the sword rather than in the Lord. And as such the Council dealt with them. Their attempt to stir up fresh disturbance, after Wyatt's rebellion had been put down, by flooding the country with revolutionary literature containing gross and scandalous attacks upon the sovereign was unquestionably the immediate cause of the severe measures taken against them. Renard, in a despatch to the emperor, dated April 22, 1554

(Tytler, p. 371), mentions incidentally the queen's indignation at the attacks made upon her. He says :

She then showed me a bill which had been thrown upon her kitchen table—the most seditious thing in the world—full of threats against herself, against the Chancellor, against the High Treasurer and others ; and in which there are strange things said about his highness and the Spaniards, openly declaring that his highness must take his chance at his coming.

It will only be necessary to quote a few passages from the works of the guiding spirits of the Reform movement to satisfy every impartial mind that, considering the excited state of the public feeling and probable effect of such productions in provoking further breaches of the peace, that as gentle measures had failed to conciliate the turbulent rabble, the Council were forced to adopt severe measures of repression. For instance, Knox, in his “Blast against the Monstrous Regimen of Women,” writes :

How abominable before God is the empire and rule of a wicked woman Horrible is the vengeance which is prepared for the promoters and for the persons promoted unless they repent. . . . Wherefore, let men that receive of women authority, honour or office, be most assuredly persuaded that in so maintaining that usurped power they declare themselves enemies of God. And finally, they must study to repress her inordinate pride and tyranny to the utmost of their power. . . . First, they ought to remove from authority that monster in Nature (so I call a woman in habit of a man, yea, a woman against Nature reigning above man). Secondarily, if they presume to defend that impiety, they ought not to fear first to pronounce and then after to execute against them the sentence of death (p. 52).

Goodman, another Reformer, and afterwards an Anglican bishop, likewise rails at the queen in the same terms in his “Superior Magistrate” :

By giving authority to an idolatrous woman you have banished Christ and His Gospel, and in His place you have restored Antichrist with all his infections wherein your own consciences condemn you of evil. Then in taking again the same authority from her, you shall restore Christ and his words do well. In obeying her you have displeased God. Then in disobeying her ye shall please God. Because you have given place to her and her counsels, you all become idolatrous hypocrites, and also traitors to your own country. By resisting her and her wicked decrees,

you must be made true worshippers of God and faithful Englishmen* (p. 103).

Ponet, in his "Treatise on Political Power," does not hesitate to say of the queen: "So that now both by God's laws and man's she ought to be punished with death" (p. 96). Works equally violent, scurrilous, and dangerous in tone were written by Bale, Traheron, Becon, Bradford, and other Reformers, and scattered broadcast through the country, of which abundant specimens may be seen in Maitland. That the fear of the effect of such writings upon the people created alarm amounting almost to a panic, we may conclude from the words of Dr. Parker (afterwards Archbishop) to Lord Keeper Bacon about certain books

that went then about London, being printed and spread abroad, and their authors *ministers of good estimation*. At which, said Parker, *exhorrescum ista legerem*. Adding, if such principles be spread in men's heads, as now they be framed and referred to the judgment of the subject to discuss *what is tyranny*, and to discern whether his prince, his landlord, his master is a tyrant by his own fancy and collect on supposed, what Lord of the Council shall ride quietly-minded in the streets among desperate beasts? What minister shall be safe in his bed-chamber?†

The more reasonable party amongst the Reformers were not slow to censure the conduct of the party of action, and to tell them that they had their own inexcusable violence to thank for the harsh measures adopted against them. We have a letter, published by David Whitehead and other English exiles, dated Frankfort, Sept. 20, 1555, in which they say:

There were interspersed in this (Knox's) publication atrocious and horrible calumnies against the Queen of England, whom Knox called at one time the "wicked Mary," at another a "monster." And he exasperated King Philip also by language not much less violent. When men had read this infamous libel, attached as they are to true religion and to our Church, they thought it neither profitable or safe to ourselves that Knox should be received with honour by our Church. . . . You cannot but be aware how unbecoming it would have been in us impotently to rage in half-muttered abuse against magistrates, not perhaps because they do not deserve it, but because of the office imposed upon them by God. This we can assure you, that that outrageous pamphlet of Knox's added much oil to the flame of persecution in England. For before the

* One of Goodman's followers actually made an attempt on the queen's life.

† Strype's "Life of Parker," i. 85.

publication of that book not one of our brethren had suffered death (Lee's "Life of Cardinal Pole," p. 193).

Collier also, in a mild way, admits the truth of this indictment, for he says :

These, it must be owned, were very unjustifiable sallies. What could be more provoking to the Court than to see the queen's honour aspersed, their religion insulted, their preachers shot at in the pulpit, and a lewd imposture played against the Government? Had the reformed been more smooth and inoffensive in their behaviour, had the eminent clergy of that party published an abhorrence of such unwarrantable methods, it is possible, some may say, they might have met with gentler usage and prevented the persecution from flaming out (ii. 371).

Long and serious debates were held in council as to what steps had best be taken to put a stop to these outrages. Mary, Philip, Cardinal Pole, and the Catholic bishops generally were understood to be opposed to extreme measures, but the majority of the Council prevailed, and it was determined to make an example that, it was hoped, would teach the Reformers the necessity of abandoning all recourse to open acts of treason and sedition. In order to add solemnity to the proceedings the Lord Chancellor, on January 22nd, called before him six prisoners who were in prison for seditious conduct. Of these, four, Hooper of Gloucester, Rogers, Prebend of St. Paul's, Saunders, Rector of All Hallows, in London, and Taylor, Rector of Hadley, in Suffolk, were condemned and executed. This was the first and only occasion in which Gardiner presided at such proceedings. Six other prisoners were also condemned on the same occasion, but on the following day Alphonso de Castro, a Spanish friar and confessor to King Philip, in a sermon before the Court, which, it was believed, was intended as a protest on behalf of the King and Queen, in order to clear themselves of all the responsibility for such proceedings, denounced these executions in the strongest terms as contrary not only to the spirit, but to the letter of the Gospel ; that it was not by severity, but by mildness, that men were to be brought into the fold of Christ, and that it was the duty of bishops not to seek the death, but to instruct the ignorance of their misguided brethren.* The result of this discourse was

* Lingard, v. 231.

that all further proceedings against the Reformers were stopped, and it is more than probable that they would not have been renewed if it had not been for the senseless fanaticism of the Reformers themselves. A few days afterwards a fanatic named Flower stabbed a priest while giving Communion at St. Margaret's, Westminster, so that not only his vestments, but the chalice were covered with blood,* and, further, it was discovered that a fresh insurrection was being organised in Cambridge, Suffolk, and Norfolk. Such conduct furnished the advocates of severe measures in the Council with an unanswerable argument, viz., that experience had fully proved that nothing but severity was of any use in dealing with men whose threatening attitude constituted a standing danger not only to the peace of the realm, but even to the life of the sovereign. The question was again debated in council, and after five weeks the advocates of severity carried the day. A Commission was issued, February 8th, 1537, to Bonner and other magistrates to this effect :

For so much, as diverse devilish and clamorous persons have not only invented, bruited and set forth divers false rumours, tales and seditious slanders against us, but also have sown divers heresies and heretical opinions and set forth divers seditious books, within this our realm of England, meaning thereby to move, procure, and set up divisions, strife, and contentions and seditions, not only amongst our beloved subjects, but also between us and our said subjects; with divers other outrageous misdemeanours, enormities, contempts and offences, daily committed and done to the disquieting of us and our people; we, minding and intending the due punishment of such offenders and repressing of such like offences, enormities and misbehaviours, have authorised, appointed, and assigned you to be our Commissioners, and by these presents do give full power and authority unto you, and three of you to inquire as well by the oaths of twelve good and lawful men as by witnesses and all other means and politic ways you can devise of all and sundry heresies, heretical opinions, lollardies, heretical and seditious books, concealments and contempts, conspiracies, and of all false rumours, tales, seditions and clamorous words and sayings published, bruited or set forth against us, or either of us, or against the quiet governance and rule of our subjects by books, letters, tales or otherwise in any county, city, borough or other place or places within this our realm of England,

and much more to the same effect. It was also ordered that—

* See other instances in Strype, iii. 210, 212.

If any person or persons . . . do obstinately persist or stand in any manner of heresy or heretical opinion . . . that the same person or persons, so standing or persisting, be delivered and committed to his ordinary, there to be used according to the spiritual and ecclesiastical laws (Rol. Pat. 3 and 4, Philip and Mary, p. 2 in dorso, given by Dodd, ii. p. clxii).

The terms of this Commission clearly prove that the measures adopted by the Council were taken for political reasons rather than purely religious ones. Parliament felt obliged to make it high treason publicly to pray for the queen's death, or to print, possess or circulate seditious literature, and it was for these offences that many of the Reformers were put on their trial.

Heylin's evidence goes to show that the Catholic bishops acted as a rule with great moderation. He says :

In all the province of York, I find none brought unto the stake but George Marsh of Chester, condemned thereto by Bishop Cotes; and not much more to be done in the four Welsh dioceses, in which, besides the burning of Bishop Ferrar at Caermarthen by Bishop Morgan, and of Rawlins and White at Cardiff by Bishop Kitchin, no extraordinary cruelty seems to have been acted. In the dioceses of Wells, Exeter, Peterborough, and Lincoln, though this last is the greatest in the kingdom, I find mention but of one apiece, of two in Ely, and of no more than three apiece at Bristol and Salisbury. In those of Oxon, Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford, I find none at all (p. 56, ed. 1661).

Pole, Gardiner, and Heath are well-known to have disapproved of the severity of the Council* as impolitic and likely rather to injure than to serve the Catholic cause. The "rattling letters" addressed from time to time to Bonner and other Catholic bishops by the Council censuring their remissness in giving effect to the instructions of the Council proves that they were unwilling to take the initiative or to do more than they could help doing—*i.e.*, try cases sent to them by the Council or by its Commissioners.† Even Bonner excused himself on this ground, that he was acting under compulsion.

I am [he said to a prisoner named Philpot] right sorry for your trouble; neither would I you should think that I am the cause thereof. I

* Lingard, v. p. 228, note 2.

† See Fox, iii. 208, 210, 223, 317, 328, 344, 522, 588, 660, 723, and Strype, iii. 239, 240.

marvel that other men should trouble me with their matters, but I must be obedient to my betters, and I fear men speak of me otherwise than I deserve.*

It may be well here to notice the calumny so often repeated, that Bonner and other Catholic bishops sent the Reformers to the stake as heretics. No Catholic bishop in Mary's reign ever sent any one to the scaffold, for the simple reason that he could not do so. The right to condemn men to death is the exclusive prerogative of the Crown, which it exercises through the criminal courts. The distinction between the criminal and ecclesiastical courts was the same then that it is now. No ecclesiastical court has ever at any time been allowed to inflict capital punishment on any one, or to do more than inflict the spiritual censures of the Church, such as suspension, degradation, and excommunication. For instance, Paul IV., in his decree of Cranmer's condemnation, which is directed to Philip and Mary, "only requires them to deal with him, after he is delivered up to the secular court, as the law directs" [*Postquam curiæ seculari traditus fuerit, id quod juris est, fieri mandetis. Ex bulla Pauli IV., Wilkin's "Conc. Mag. Brit." vol. iv. page 132*] without the least insinuation of any bodily punishment. The same sentence, in similar cases, is so universally understood not to extend to mutilation, or taking away the life of the delinquent, that the bishop, or whoever delivers him to the civil magistrate, always concludes the proceedings of the spiritual court in this manner.

We beseech you, with all earnestness, that for the love of Almighty God, and on the motive of compassion, and because we ask it of you, that you will not condemn this miserable person to death, or the loss of his limbs. [*Ibid.* p. 136].

In the writ for Cranmer's execution, the king and queen expressly take notice, that the criminal being condemned for heresy and degraded, as the Church neither had, nor ought to proceed any further in the affair, he was delivered over to them (the king and queen) *according to the laws and customs of the realm, provided in such cases, and condemned to be burnt, in detestation of his guilt, and for a warning to other Christians†*

* Fox, iii. 462.

† Above extract from "History of the Life of Reginald Pole," vol. ii., 2nd ed., pp. 225, 226. London, 1767. Anon.

[Et cum etiam mater Ecclesia non habet quod ulterius in hoc parte faciat, aut facere debeat. . . . Juxta leges consuetudines Regni nostri Angliæ damnatum et degradatum comburi facietis, in hujusmodi criminis detestationem, et aliorum Christianorum exemplum manifestum. *Ibid.* page 140. Ex. Rol. Pat. 2° et 2° Phil. et Mar. pars 2].*

Before judging too severely the action of Mary's Council, it is only fair to remember the excessive severity of the criminal law at the time. For instance, Hamilton, in his "History of Quarter Sessions from Elizabeth to Anne," p. 31, says that at Exeter in 1598, the result of the two Assizes and four Quarter Sessions was the hanging of seventy-four persons for comparatively trivial offences, such as sheep stealing. Sir James Stephen, in his "History of English Criminal Law" (i. 467), remarks upon this fact: "If the average number of executions in each county were twenty or a little more than a quarter of the number of capital sentences in Devonshire in 1598, this would make 800 executions a year in the forty English counties." And this under Elizabeth, who is called the "Good Queen Bess!"

Considering the provocation given, and comparing the conduct of Mary's Government with that of those of Henry VIII., Edward VI. and Elizabeth, it certainly cannot fairly be charged with exceptional severity. There can be little doubt that any of these governments would have acted with equal if not greater severity. The persecution continued more or less during the three last years of Mary's reign. Sometimes milder counsels prevailed. On one occasion all prisoners were liberated on the easy condition of swearing to be true to God and the queen (Strype, iii. 307). Fresh conspiracies were hatched, to which the Council replied by fresh executions. Noailles was the Mephistopheles of Mary's reign. It was his continual plotting that brought so many of the Reformers, who were foolish enough to join in his intrigues, within the meshes of the law. The persecution of Protestants was undertaken on political rather than religious grounds. They were held responsible, and justly so, for Wyatt's rebellion and other attempts against the Government. There is not a

* The parts in brackets are footnotes in original.

single instance to be found in the whole of Mary's reign of any leading Protestant, who was loyal to the queen and behaved himself as a good and peaceable citizen, being molested on account of his religion. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and others, although burnt as heretics, had already compromised themselves by public acts of treason and sedition against the Crown and Government; acts which under the ordinary law deserved capital punishment.

It is not the object of this paper to detail the well-known facts of Mary's reign, to be found in any ordinary history, and so we must hasten to the end. Mary's health gradually declined. Owing to the prevalence of continuous wet weather, while residing at Richmond in the spring of 1558, she caught a bad intermittent fever, and on November 17, 1558, she died. The Duchess of Feria, her intimate friend, thus describes her last end:

That morning hearing mass, which was celebrated in her chamber, she being at the last point (for no day passed in her life that she heard not mass) and although sick to death, she heard it with so good attention, zeal and devotion, as she answered in every part with him that served the priest; such yet was the quickness of her senses and memory; and when the priest came to that part to say *Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi*, she answered plainly and distinctly to every one, *Miserere nobis, Miserere nobis, Dona nobis pacem*. Afterwards, seeming to meditate something with herself, when the priest took the Sacred Host to consume it, she adored it with her voice and countenance, presently closed her eyes, and rendered her blessed soul to God. This the duchess related to me, tears pouring from her eyes, that the last thing the queen saw in this world was her Saviour and Redeemer in the sacramental species; no doubt to behold Him presently after in His glorious Body in heaven. A blessed and glorious passage. *Anima mea cum anima ejus* ("Life of the Duchess of Feria," p. 71).

She was buried on the north side of Henry VII.'s Chapel. Two small tablets, erected by order of James I., mark the spot where she and her half-sister Elizabeth are buried, with this simple inscription:

"Regno Consortes et urna obdormimus hic Elisabetha et Maria Sorores in spe Resurrectionis."

Whilst holding that Mary Tudor was personally by far the best and noblest of the Tudors, it is not necessary to maintain that she was a great ruler, or that she made no political mis-

takes. Her extreme leniency in dealing with traitors in the beginning of her reign was probably a political mistake, which in some measure created the necessity for the severe measures that had to be taken afterwards.

Her marriage with Philip of Spain was certainly a political mistake, which gave her enemies a handle against her, though it is not easy to see what other alliance was open to her. Her aversion to all duplicity was also diplomatically a mistake. It enabled her enemies to take measures to frustrate her best intentions. It may be said that the queen must be held responsible for all that was done during her reign, and in a sense that is true. But, on the other hand, we must remember that Mary was the first queen regnant, and that under our system of government the sovereign is very much in the hands of her ministers. Every English sovereign is obliged to be guided by the advice of responsible ministers, even in matters which they personally may not approve of. Mary had repeatedly declared that she would do nothing without the sanction of Parliament. Again, it may be said that she ought not to have selected such well-known, cruel, and anti-Papal ministers as Paulet, Arundel, and Petre. But here, again, it must be pointed out that the queen was not free to select whom she would. Her choice was determined by circumstances. She had to choose her ministers from the majority in Parliament, and trust to their patriotism to consult the best interests of the country. Mary is to be held personally responsible for the burning of heretics, only in the same sense in which Queen Victoria is to be held responsible for the massacre of Sepoys during the Indian Mutiny.

The chief error of one-sided historians is a negative one. They ought not to have ignored Mary's virtues. They ought not to have forgotten the gentleness, the mercy and generosity with which she treated her enemies, till their conduct became so intolerable as to force her Government to reverse her policy. They should have weighed more carefully the early wrongs that wrapped her later life in gloom, as set forth in the words put into her mouth by a modern poet :

Sum up my personal life. You knew me first
A daughter witness of her mother's wrongs,

A daughter conscious of her father's crimes,
 A princess shorn of her inheritance,
 A lady taunted with foul bastardy,
 A sister from a brother's heart estranged,
 A sister by a sister's hand betrayed,
 A rightful queen hemmed by usurping bands,
 A reigning queen baited by slaves she spared,
 A maid betrothed stung by the love she trusted,
 A wedded wife spurned from the hand that won her.*

Thus the "red spectre" of Protestant history has disappeared and has given place to the figure of a lady who, for the excellence of her personal character, her stern sense of duty, her patriotism, and her earnest desire to do what she conceived the best for her country, resembled our present Queen more than any female sovereign that ever sat upon the throne of England. Mr. Tytler closes his work with the following remark :

Amid the exaggerated praises of the Roman Catholic writers and the high-wrought invectives of their Protestant opponents, the calm and unprejudiced decision of Bishop Godwin, himself a Protestant, is perhaps the nearest to the truth : she was a lady very godly, merciful, chaste, and every way praiseworthy, if you regard not the errors of her religion.

Mulier sane pia, clemens, moribusque castissimis, si religionis errorem non spectes (p. 340. London, 1630).

Time has rolled back the cloud of calumny in which Mary's enemies have sought to enshroud her memory and has given effect to the motto she wished to have inscribed upon her tomb :

Bury me with my mother,
 Raise tombs of honour to our memory,
 And grave on mine the motto I have loved—
 Prophetic may it prove—Time unveils Truth.

J. D. BREEN, O.S.B.

* Sir Aubrey de Vere's "Mary Tudor," p. 319.

ART. IX.—MR. BALFOUR'S PHILOSOPHY.

The Foundations of Belief, being Notes introductory to the Study of Theology. By the Right Hon. A. J. BALFOUR. Third Edition. London: 1895.

LIKE a musical symphony, this polished, ingenious, and suggestive volume falls into three parts, the first and the last of which are easier to follow, and much more taking, than the middle. With Mr. Balfour's assault upon the Naturalism born in some scientific brains of a knowledge wrongly interpreted, it is impossible not to sympathise. With his argument for the completion of physics by metaphysics, for the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, as alone justified by the Religion in which they find an everlasting foundation, no Christian, and assuredly no Catholic, will be disposed to quarrel. But the author himself, sensitively anxious not to steal away our assent by rhetoric, has warned us that we may purchase certain very precious things at famine prices. And if we are asked to buy Religion at the expense of Reason—to be sceptics in order that we may have faith; and to turn first principles into mere assumptions—we can hardly be deemed over-scrupulous in cross-examining the apologetics, which appear to contravene Bishop Butler's sovereign maxim whereby we are forbidden to set down reason as delusive or superfluous.

Many sentences, scattered up and down these eloquent paragraphs, sound the alarm. But there is one, towards the latter end of the volume, which is as frank as it is uncomfortable to the mind nourished on Catholic teaching. So far as Mr. Balfour can see, he tells us, "rational necessity does not carry us at the best beyond a system of mere 'solipsism.'" And what is this strange-looking system, denoted by so singular a name? It is the doctrine of Fichte, far celebrated and long ago laughed to scorn, that each man knows absolutely nothing but himself, and the creations, or shadows, or outward-seeming projections of his own mind. The Ego which I am is all I can ever apprehend. I make my world, and it is a dream—no more. I am a prisoner within painted walls, beyond which

what is there? The paintings themselves are but an adornment which I, the artist, have devised from my own fancies; they yield no information touching a world independent of me, or existing when I am not there to look upon it. Knowledge, then, according to Fichte, was the dream of a dreamer who could not wake out of his sleep. It was wholly subjective; in the strictest sense a fiction, made by the Ego in trance. And this, if we are to read Mr. Balfour's sentence in the light of everyday English, is the sum and substance of that knowledge at which we arrive by "rational necessity."

A paradox, or a dangerous and unfounded principle! Certainly a paradox. For what does all the world understand by the word "rational"? That which reason can prove by argument? If so, the axioms and postulates, the self-evident propositions, without which reason cannot prove anything at all, would be "non-rational"; and what becomes of our mathematics, our abstract logic, the principle of contradiction itself? Or does "rational" signify, not merely that which reason demonstrates, but that which reason perceives, affirms because it is "*per se notum*" (in the language of Aristotle and the Schools), declares with perfect certitude, spontaneous or reflex? If this latter position be granted, Mr. Balfour's "rational necessity" strikes its flag to Fichte. And equally so if it be denied. For then, as it is certain that first truths, whether abstract or concrete, are incapable of demonstration, it follows that, since we do not know them by their self-evidence, we can affirm them only by instinct. Now instinct, as such, is blind; and to establish the whole of human knowledge upon that which has none in itself, is to drive us back into the prison of non-verified and unverifiable assumptions. We may indeed trust in them, but our trust, like every other act of a purely subjective intellect, will be part and parcel of one great delusion, the spell of which no reasoning can dissolve.

Here, as I am compelled to think, is the peril of a treatment only too well calculated to become popular in these days of a decadent sentimentalism, murmuring against the Naturalist guides who have led it into the wilderness, but so incurably sceptical that it feels disposed to believe once more in the old, simply because it has given up trusting in the new. Again and again, as I turn these pages, I am reminded of a witty

saying I heard upon occasion, to the effect that "Science and Religion are both false; but Religion is not quite so false as Science." Unhandsome, not to say unfair, as it would be to welcome the kind intentions of Mr. Balfour with this cynical epigram, must we not feel that his strong indictment of Reason, his appeal to "non-rational impulse," his disparagement, no less continual than passionate, of the function which intellect is called upon to exercise in the individual, his reduction of what used to be known as "antecedent probability" to "climate" and "prejudice," his denial that authority, though a "motive," can be, in the vast majority of cases, a "reason" such as theologians have always insisted that it was, his explanation of metaphysical grounds as biological needs, and, in general, the superseding of evidence by instinct to which he is ever resorting, leave us with no standard—I do not say upon which to argue with unbelievers or to engage in written controversy—but whereby to discriminate between the prepossessions out of which springs Naturalism, and the reasonable convictions in the strength of which we do homage to a sound philosophy and subscribe the articles of the Catholic faith? If the empirical champions, Mr. Spencer, Professor Huxley, and John Mill rely at last upon instinct, and if St. Paul and St. Thomas Aquinas do no more, why should I choose to follow the orthodox when their adversaries hold out to me a number of agreeable inducements to go with them? Is it all a matter of liking, or of association? How, then, is it not a matter of taste for which the individual need not apologise, but likewise need offer no excuse? Unless temperament, training, impulse, "climate" itself, can be brought down, directly or indirectly, to reason with its evidences and its intellectual justifications, all Mr. Balfour's persuasive and forcible reasoning in detail *is* so much rhetoric, rational as regards the terms chosen, but addressed to the fancy, the passions, the idiosyncrasies of those who feel with him. It is advocacy clad in argument, and takes for granted that which is in dispute.

Such indeed we should reckon it, were the beginning and the end of his discussion to be set down at the value which his theory puts upon them. Yet, by some rare good fortune, though with the sacrifice of consistency, our apologist exemplifies in arguing against Materialism the method of a

school whose principles are sounder than his own. It is altogether in the Christian tradition of philosophy to show, as Mr. Balfour succeeds most admirably in showing, that a blind mechanical interpretation of phenomena, where, in the causes and conditions of the universe, Mind has no place, can neither explain nor even tolerate Mind in the effects; that such a scheme is as incapable of producing, as it is imbecile in accounting for, the sacredness of ethics, the specific meaning of the Beautiful, and the aims, the contents, or the validity of that reasoning power without which it could not stir one step. All this we applaud and admire, not chiefly because it gratifies our taste, or chimes in with prejudices long nurtured within us, or responds to an instinct the comfort of which we have oftentimes experienced, but on this account, that the intellect, enlightened by its own certitude, is aware that effects cannot excel their causes, and perceives in this lucid and cogent reasoning an application of principles which it sees to be self-evident. The conclusions are gained by legitimate process; given Naturalism, what will follow; and again, what things are there which never can follow? Mr. Balfour reasons like Newton, like St. Thomas, like St. Augustine, by the indirect method, "ex absurdo" or "per impossibile," various instances of which may be studied in Euclid's geometry, the pattern of strictest demonstration. He is, therefore, well warranted in pursuing his successful campaign, and the marvel is that he should overlook the very principles whereby he wins an undoubted triumph over the forces of Nescience.

Let us dwell for a moment on this battlefield and its issues. Some, who desire above all things fairness in dealing with a declared enemy, have asked whether it is allowable to eliminate in our consideration ex. gr. of Professor Huxley's teaching, all that makes for a larger and more tolerable view of existence than Naturalism strictly defined. Are there not, these would say, elements of the transcendental—tokens of a belief in absolute truth, in categorical ethics—left here and there amid the dross-heaps of an empirical system, which we are bound to take into our account? And does Mr. Balfour, while overthrowing that system with victorious energy, reply to the thought, the spirit, animated by which these cried-up exponents of scientific dogmas have won so favourable a hearing?

The answer to such kindly preoccupations must surely be that a philosophical argument keeps in view, not persons, but propositions; that criticism addresses itself to the whole, indeed, of a man's utterances, but may properly select from them governing and predominant principles, admitted on both sides as representing what the teacher would uphold with entire assent. And it is good logic to require that if the teaching be inconsistent, not negatively, but so as to amount to a clear contradiction, one or other part of it shall be surrendered. Mr. Balfour, in his opening section, has done no more than this; and he could do no less. The very point which he sets himself to bring out in clear daylight, is that all who build Naturalism upon Science are falling into contradiction. They cannot stand where they are. A profound discord runs between the beliefs on which society is held together—beliefs that the great men of Naturalism cling to, as members of the body politic in which they thrive—and the social creed suggested by doctrines of evolution from which every trace of Mind, creative or constructive, has been omitted. Why should this momentous fact be kept out of sight? It has an immense scientific value, an incalculable meaning and scope in history. Perhaps there is no duty so pressing as to compel men, even at the cost of pain on their part and ours, to recognise exactly what is the drift of speculations, of lectures, of treatises grave and gay, which propose to substitute for the principles of ethics, for the conduct of life, now accepted on tradition, an account of human origins, a forecast of our destiny, that would reverse our most cherished maxims, and make absurd or quixotic the ideals on which Christendom has looked with reverence during its career of centuries.

The more so that no small number have been captivated by the authority of scientific lights, judged to be infallible, and not thrown into eclipse by offences against the code of morals still reigning amongst us. If they can fulfil the ethical demands, if they seem especially devoted to the service of truth, and yet have broken with Religion, what harm need we suppose will ensue—so runs the argument—when we have all made up our minds to live without God in the world? Look at the illustrious men who believe only in the phenomenal, the finite. Have they no system of ethics? Nay, some are

"altruists" by profession, and hold the Christian cheap who is intent upon saving his own soul, which, after Leigh Hunt, they call "other worldliness." Progress again is their war-cry. Mr. Spencer, the prophet of a material synthesis, never wearies of announcing that Evolution will bring in perfection when its last day is come. Professor Huxley, though indisposed to sketch a future Paradise, rises on exulting wing, and is assuredly no pessimist. George Eliot expressed her astonishment when told that her stories made people sad. Positivism, in its author, Comte, as in his fervid disciples, sings like a troubadour; and, did we let ourselves be persuaded by the airs to which it has set its doctrines, it might be termed "*le gai saber*." By a species of mirage, or day-dream, that to others must seem amazing, the partisans of a scheme in which free-will cannot exist, behold freedom in a future whose creatures shall be simply automata—see in the mortality of man motives for heroic striving, and chant enthusiastically of the good they mean to accomplish—which will last how long? Their feminine poet answers, and deems it glad tidings of great joy:

That better self shall live till human Time
Shall fold its eyelids, and the human sky
Be gathered like a scroll within the tomb
Unread for ever.

Neither its friends nor its enemies should be sorry that an acute, candid, well-read student like Mr. Balfour has done his utmost to show forth the precise bearing of a creed so portentous. If it has consequences which affect life in every department, let us know them as they are. May we still talk of "reverence," or the "absolute nature of Duty," under a dispensation governed, shaped, and directed by the struggle for existence? How can unthinking particles originate the idea of a categorical imperative? how justify it? Again, if appetites are evolved in a certain order during that struggle, why should we call some of them more dignified than others? We do not talk of dignity in a machine, but of convenience. Thus the Moral Law has no claim, in a mindless evolution, to be more than "ingenious"—a contrivance for the benefit of the species, like the ten thousand expedients, some grotesque,

many disgusting or frightful, which have arisen, though not by design, from the interminable contest of atoms, germs, and individualities, all struggling and all blind. Why choose out one of these products, and make it supreme above the universe? Here are mechanical forces which masquerade as motives; have they anything sacred in them? So little, it would appear, that Mr. Spencer in his system of ethics—a point on which the author might have insisted—never but once, and that with manifest incongruity, applies to his pleasure-giving innate calculus, the epithets which betoken true moral worthiness. His law is not holy or righteous; those who subdue it to their needs and requirements neither worship, nor love, nor revere it. And they may well ask on what grounds an instinct or a tendency deserves personal recognition which is just as little free, or self-conscious, as the solar system whereof it is a particular but necessary outcome? Mr. Spencer, indeed, takes large pains to make it evident that matter is quite as good as mind; for, he says, in a most instructive and marvellous chapter, if it be true that mind “glances from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,” and is, in Aristotle’s phrase, universal, yet do not the particles of ether undulate with incredible velocity and run to the ends of the world? An excellent, a conclusive demonstration if mind be only matter in some degree complicated; and a sure sign that when evolution is fully understood in the empirical sense man will account himself a plexus of atoms and nothing more; his faculties will seek their justification in utilities bounded by the grave; and reverence, holiness, purity, and conscience will be words without a meaning as without a scope.

All this, in language of studied moderation, as clear as it is searching, Mr. Balfour has brought home to an audience, miscellaneous enough, but not likely to forget the lesson they have learnt. Summing it up, he contends that if reason be not the ground of existence, but one expedient among many, we, then, with our faculties of knowledge and religion—our ethics, æsthetics, and scientific curiosity—are a kind of “sport,” and the universe itself despicable. Our delusion of free-will is ludicrous; our morality “a deliberate fraud;” and the higher emotions and sensibilities, the aspirations and ideals on which we argue to man’s especial nobleness among

the animated beings around him, are "in their origin contemptible, in their suggestion mendacious." For what is this ethical Good? "A catalogue of utilitarian precepts," replies the Empiricist. What, again, is the Beautiful? What except "the chance occasion of passing pleasures?" And the True itself, on which science rests, in the pursuit of which it has achieved such mighty deeds, and come to its place of honour? It is, says Naturalism, by the lips of many prophets, "a dim passage from one set of unthinking habits to another;" a break in the unconscious, with nescience before and behind it; an accompaniment, often superfluous, and in any case doomed to extinction, of certain molecular throbbings in a tiny planet, lost amid the world systems, a speck amid infinitudes.

The prologue is excellent; now for the play. Naturalism, which loudly trumpets the defeat of Religion, and dissolves morality into molecules, has, of course, its own ground, upon which it may fairly be examined. Let us endeavour to state the case, now that other systems and principles have been cleared out of our path. Never must it be forgotten that the prime postulate is the absence of Thought, Reason, Intellect, from the beginnings in which all that we know, or can know, has taken its rise. Once man was not. In that day, therefore, Reason was not. But a universe existed; atoms fell into combinations; the great world-machine did not wait to come into being until man opened his eyes, and saw and understood. Such is the doctrine of Naturalism; a finite, or infinite material universe, prior to all thought, enduring through all time. How does Naturalism know these things? By a judgment founded on "experience." And not on any principle which "experience" has not furnished? On none whatever; science is the outcome of an experience that certifies itself. For did not even Hume, the most sceptical of sceptics, bid his disciples confine their studies to mathematics and "experimental reasoning?" This, then, is sure, and all else delusion, sophistry, the "high priori" road that leads no whither.

Admirable, observes Mr. Balfour, if science could dispense with "presuppositions." Did the lynx-eyed Scotsman who bowed so courteously towards it, believe that it could? The categories, for instance, of time and space? Science deals with phenomena in the order of their succession; what *is* suc-

cession? Is it real or ideal? It is uniform, say a great multitude. How do we prove its uniformity? By experience, they reply. "What," cries the philosopher, "by my miserable experience during a score of years, and that far from uniform if I am to judge of it, I dare to lay down the law for all time and all existence!" Here is an induction, and no mistake! premisses of a moment, conclusions reaching through eternity. By what wonderful alchemy, beyond Paracelsus and Van Helmont, extract from evanescent effects such as these a knowledge of the Cosmos, boundless, objective, and, according to the school of scientific Nescience, in itself unknowable? How, from sensations alone, the whole of experience when mental first principles are left out of account, infer the cause that produced them? But "matter," the Naturalist may say, "is congruous to the rest of our beliefs, hence we affirm it." Not the matter which is all that your science terms objective, Mr. Balfour rejoins, for it is neither coloured nor audible; its secondary qualities depend on eye and ear; why, even, should we suppose that its primary—extension and inertia—are aught but the judgment of the Ego dealing with states of consciousness? The ghost which was laid by experimental reasoning returns. For we have always to ascertain our experience as a fact—which involves the truth and competency of our senses to reach the objective—and to justify it as part of a world subject to law and order; but this can never be accomplished without taking for granted that Nature is uniform. Deny me such principles, and I am at a loss to prove, nay, to suspect on reasonable grounds, the existence of any other than myself in the universe. What I call history, the stored-up accumulations of human energies, the experience of the race, I shall learn to be real, and not a chapter in my own dreaming, only when I admit the principle of causation, but not till then. Let me attempt to demonstrate it from facts of mere sense, and I cannot so much as make a beginning.

Then, it will be objected, the writer overthrows Naturalist pretensions by sapping and mining all our knowledge; he is a universal sceptic on the pattern of Montaigne, and ought to conclude with that imperturbable disbeliever in science, "*Ce sont tous songes et fanatiques folies.*" No, I say, not in this long and decisive argument; elsewhere, if at all, but not here.

The sum total of his reasoning might be given in the weighty words of Aristotle, as the Latin has them, "*Physica, ergo, est sapientia quidem, sed non prima.*" And again, though science which employs the balance and lights the furnace deals directly with the sensible, yet its dealing is intellectual; and without first principles, true but incapable of demonstration, the intellect is for ever dumb. To escape that necessity of admitting intuitive and self-evident axioms—a confession which leads on to the spiritual, the intelligible, and the Divine world, far above sense, and establishing Religion upon thought and reason—the mere Naturalist has taken his stand on sense. But the ground sinks under him. For there is no science of disconnected and incoherent particulars; and our microscopic observations will issue in the large judgments of mechanics, optics, astronomy, chemistry, of biological and nebular evolution, only when the grains of sand which exceed our reckoning are subdued to order and unity by a principle they illustrate, but can never simply prove.

To urge this saving truth upon the men of the laboratory is by no means to declare their science hollow and unreal; with far more justice might we maintain that every one among them who calls in question the self-evidence of his own methods and principles, reducing to sensation that which holds of the intellect, is encouraging a frame of mind which sooner or later must work irreparable harm to that noble spirit of curiosity, and blunt that zeal for investigation, which have raised the Keplers and the Herschells to a godlike eminence. He who defends the autonomy of Reason in its own sphere, is a friend, not to metaphysics alone, but also to physics and the arts of life. And Mr. Balfour, instead of flinging broadcast the seeds of scepticism when he points to the need of major propositions if we wish to secure the minors, is giving to experimental studies a solidity which their proper exponents have not always known how to obtain. In the "science of science" they are seldom initiated. Their great assumption, uniform Nature, has long been—to quote Dr. Ward's scathing but just language—their opprobrium. What is the result? Is it not the eternal see-saw of Realism and Idealism, swinging up and down in empty space, according as science is asked for its credentials, or relies upon its conclusions? Their critic charges men like Professor Huxley and

Mr. Spencer, the "leading philosophic empiricists," with destroying in the name of experience that which claims to be experience reduced to system. Each of these thinkers has recognised the necessity of some independent reality that shall furnish a ground to the "ever-moving stream of sensations—our immediate experience." Each, again, "has rejected the independent reality which is postulated and explained by science." And each "has substituted for it a private reality of his own." Does the physicist assume "actual atoms, and motions, and forces?" Of these John Mill knows nothing as an empiricist; to him reality signifies "permanent possibilities of sensation," which need not be forces, or atoms, or motions, but, as other and more penetrating philosophers have suggested, the effective volitions of disembodied personal agents. Consider, in this light, Mr. Spencer's "unknowable." It is not in space; it possesses neither mass nor extension; it is incapable of motion; it exists beyond time. This, the scientific inquirer will grant, his instruments and registers cannot deal with; for all he knows, it might as well be a chimera in vacuo, an algebraic minus x irreducible to any intelligible terms. Yet, in Mr. Spencer's opinion, it is the only real. Of Professor Huxley's "symbols," representing an unknown, what need to speak? They are openly founded on assumptions; by an act of faith, the grounds of which remain for ever a mystery, Professor Huxley springs up into a universe ready-made, and takes to himself the inheritance which his acute and unwearied predecessors have bequeathed to him. "Wie herrlich weit und breit!" exclaims the poet of Weimar. Yes, but the title-deeds? For, as I have elsewhere been allowed to argue, this brave scheme of things is matter; and the Professor tells me that matter is a property of mind. What, then, is mind? The bewildering answer comes, that it is a property, or result, of matter. In this vicious circle Naturalism turns round, like a blind horse in a mill. It dare not concede that the Mind, by which the world of matter was called into being, disposed in its ranks and orders, guided along the path of development, is anterior to man's own; for, let so much be true, and Theism follows. But if the objective universe came first, and intellect did not shape it, nor was among its causes, then Mind is the chance result of the irrational. On the other hand, Hume and

Kant between them have shown the futility of attempting to discover in this same sensible experience, taken alone, anything but its own contents; and these are not "matter," extended or inert, but sensations. From which it would appear that the existence of a universe independent of our feelings may be, indeed, affirmed by subjective necessity, yet is no more than hypothetical; and, as Mr. Balfour urges with remarkable clearness, is an immense assumption to account for so little as "the sequences familiar to us," in the petty round of our daily life and custom.

We stand, therefore, face to face with these alternatives: Either physical science relies on axioms self-evident, or it is without a rational basis. If it appeals, in this extremity, to faith or instinct, the writer accepts and clenches the proposal. Faith shall be the principle, provided that not science alone, but ethics, æsthetics, and religion are granted an equal privilege. Are all the departments of intellectual research and affirmation subject to the same law? Has our concrete knowledge, whether scientific or theological, need of convictions for which no proof can be tendered; and does it begin with an exercise not of reason but of trust? See, then, as Mr. Spencer would observe, the consequences. We may not, henceforth, erect "science" into a tribunal, infallible, and of the last resort, before which Religion shall be dragged like a culprit, guilty of affirming without warrant, and dogmatising at its ease. Science, too, has dogmatised, nor can help dogmatising. Could we be sure that physicists held a creed to whose canons of proof, themselves not requiring demonstration, all other doctrine must be conformed as to a touchstone, the view now in the ascendant would rightly prevail, and every theological statement, if unsupported by science, we should term doubtful, if inconsistent with science, false. The course of reasoning which we have just gone through proves that we are sure of exactly the opposite. Science, ethics, religion are in the same boat; they must sink or swim together. The difficulties to which we find them liable in common far exceed those which are special to any of them. To reconcile one with another by giving up what is characteristic of each is not a deliverance from its burden, but merely shifting it, whether with certain of the "unco guid" we lay science under a ban, or think, as do

the Rationalist theologians, to make terms with science, and surrender a part of our doctrine, in the vain hope of keeping what is left. For the "ultimate ideas" on which physical inquiries proceed are no less amenable to criticism demanding proofs, than the dogmas in which hitherto religious men have gloried or the irreligious taken occasion to blaspheme. Naturalism and theology, from their very definitions, are irreconcilable; science and religion, when their statements are well seen into, have no quarrel.

So far the court—by which I mean the Catholic and scholastic tradition—is with Mr. Balfour. We delight in his appeal to ultimate ideas; we grant the force of his argumentum ad hominem. And when he resumes the same treatment—which he does in his last section—we go along with him willingly. But we decline to proceed through the Serbonian bog, in which whole armies have been lost, that he has almost wantonly spread between his criticism of the "Naturalist" and his apology for the theologian. Ultimate ideas, we affirm with St. Thomas and his Greek master, shine by their own radiance, are self-evident, indemonstrable, and intuitively certain. We do not take them on trust; nor is "faith" an appropriate name for the faculty or treasure of first principles—"habitus principiorum"—that yields to us "the master-light of all our seeing." Neither, again, is our knowledge of them simply abstract, as though we lived in a world of pure mathematics where all indeed was true, nothing was concrete. *How* we recognise them in particulars, by what process we apply them to the phenomena of sense, to the inward life of consciousness, may be an abstruse, perhaps an insoluble problem. Furthermore, to know and apply them we need not deliberately advert to them; or else genius creating its immortal and most profoundly rational works of Art, must deny itself the power of evoking a Hamlet or a Ninth Symphony, until it can explain how the miracle is done. But intellectual certitudes, though not analysed into their grounds, nor countersigned by reflexion upon them, persuade us not as an instinct urging to action, but as principles known to be true. Inasmuch as they are never demonstrable, they have this negative quality in common with "trust" or "faith." The difference, however, is manifest. Faith relies on the statement of another intellect. Necessary intuitive truths are statements which the intellect

makes to itself. Again, they cannot be assimilated to instinct, for instinct has no light, lays down no affirmations, is, at the most, expectant not apodictic, nor combines the terms of a proposition, seen to be true of one another, into the same sentence. But, of course, there are classes of certitudes, according to the subject-matter which they affect; and physical certitude is one thing, metaphysical, whether direct or reflex, another.

Had Mr. Balfour given us a dissertation on these well-known doctrines, before engaging in his Serbonian bog, he might have saved himself and his readers a world of trouble. It is impossible, at this stage in the journey, not to remark that, while his method in general takes us within sight of a famous and subtle guide through the mazes of concrete reasoning,—everyone will have already named in his own mind Cardinal Newman,—the younger student is at once more involved in explanation and far less satisfactory in treatment. The “Grammar of Assent” has for its object to reconcile in a philosophical view what may seem to be the anomalies and want of logic that cling to our reasoning about facts. It takes a distinct and novel course, not much regarding the traditional methods, and fully allowing the margin or gulf between premisses and conclusion which has provoked so many into Idealism. But whereas Mr. Balfour does not shrink from telling us,—and this, undoubtedly, is the heart of Montaigne’s teaching,—that “Certitude is found to be the child, not of Reason, but of Custom,” the Catholic writer distinguishes and defines (as in so delicate and difficult an investigation will ever be a duty), and will on no account let the doctrine pass that we “trust our faculties,” or that certitudes which are not reflex should be considered blind, or that the man who is no philosopher goes by mere custom when he affirms or denies. It is not custom, but a genuine intellectual power, as true a “*habitus principiorum*” as the syllogizing faculty itself, to which Newman bids us recur for the justification of knowledge in the concrete. “His illative sense” is neither faith nor merely an instinct; it has not only a range but a sanction; it apprehends, compares, judges with precisely as clear a jurisdiction, and on motives that are as undoubtedly “reasons,” as the abstract intellect that lays down principles of universal relevance, and affirms because it perceives their truth. Such a distinct

power may, to the scholastic mind, appear superfluous, but only because in its Aristotelian system it finds, or thinks that it finds, a faculty of concrete knowledge already provided.

We do not need to pursue this domestic controversy further. But we do need to insist, with the greatest possible emphasis, that while Cardinal Newman sets up a distinct power of the intellect to attain his purpose, and will not hear of "faith" as the foundation on which to build, the present volume turns from intellect to habit or emotion, and can discover no rational necessity for holding that there is a single existence, material or spiritual, outside the writer's own Ego. The Cardinal has, in any alternative, enriched our nature with true mental faculties; the sceptical metaphysician who leaps to the concrete by an act of faith, runs no small risk of analysing all our certitudes into assumptions without a basis. What is he, then, but an empiricist, at one with his opponents in their method, although dissenting from their inferences? They prefer matter; he is enamoured of spirit. To them religion seems a non-rational hypothesis; to him it is the same, but commended by its ethical advantages. They love the world that now is; he looks forward to the world to come. Both worlds, however, seek in vain for the rational certitude on which we might affirm either; and custom, that makes of some agnostics and of others church-going Christians, is the last word in the system. Who but will allow, with the great French essayist to whom we have likened Mr. Balfour, that here is "a final trick of fence," and "an extreme remedy?" "*C'est un coup desespéré,*" says Montaigne with his usual frankness, "*auquel il faut abandonner vos armes, pour faire perdre à vostre adversaire les siennes.*" But universal doubt rather than religious dogma will gain by the stroke that smites Reason to the ground. And though we anathematize Rationalism, it is neither necessary nor expedient to give up the just claims of a Natural Theology, the rudiments of which may be discerned, not only in the Book of Wisdom, but in the Hebrew Psalms and the Prophets whose authority Mr. Balfour will not question.

"A scheme of great historic importance,"—such is the account given us of the distinction between Natural and Revealed Theology, by means of which "Evidences" have been proposed to men of science and the lay intellect, without calling

in faith. Yes, certainly historic; older by many centuries than Paley; a manner of reasoning which goes back to the first Christian apologists, to Minutius Felix, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and which has never ceased out of use in our tradition. We cannot, except we would stultify and desert the teachers whom we most dearly venerate, surrender the doctrine, now established on the authority of an Ecumenical Council in a set decree, that Reason,—not the assumption of faith, but reason as distinct from faith and independent of it,—is capable of proving “from the things that are made,” the existence, the power, and the glory of their Creator. Is this to “run modern science and theology into a single coherent and self-sufficient system of thought?” And does it take from science “all the premisses on which theological conclusions are afterwards based?” If so, Mr. Balfour sets it aside as inadequate; nay more, he condemns it as in practice, and (unless I mistake him), at last in theory, identical with the Naturalism whose premisses, methods, and conclusions he declares that it has borrowed. The inference now is, therefore, to Authority in the proper sense of the word. Reason is impotent, or else it yields us up, bound hand and foot, into the tyranny of that sceptical Empiricism which can neither perceive nor explain the meaning of Truth, Beauty, Goodness. A serious allegation, not to be passed over without challenge!

Some embarrassment, however, arises from the loose indefinite fashion in which terms needing careful discrimination are handled. I understand what is meant by Naturalism; it is the development of all things known to us from elements in which there was no Mind, and under the action of mindless forces. But what is Rationalism? In the Catholic schools we take it to signify the attempt to prove by reason dogmas of the Faith which are above and beyond reason, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Real Presence. We never should allow that the exercise of reason whereby philosophers and the multitude have, in their several methods, made clear to themselves the existence of God, His Providence, and the life to come, was that excess and perversion of reasoning to which the name of Rationalism ought alone to be given. Put the “Christian Evidences” on one side for a moment. They do not stand on the same level with arguments which propose to

conclude to the great leading truths of Natural Religion ; for, what is called the "*Demonstratio Evangelica*" does but make the fact of Revelation "*credible*," whereas the process of reasoning which we employ in showing that there is a Personal God, our Creator, Ruler, and Supreme Judge, aims at nothing less than certitude. None of our apologists have shrunk from adopting the strong language of Cicero when he stakes his argument not on faith but on sight, "*Quid potest esse tam apertum tamque perspicuum*," says the philosophic heathen, "*cum cœlum suspeximus cœlestiaque contemplati sumus, quam esse aliquod Numen præstantissimæ mentis, quo hæc reguntur ?*" To the same effect St. Augustine, "*Deus ubique secretus est, ubique publicus ; quem nulli licet, ut est, cognoscere, et quem nemo permittitur ignorare.*" And the whole doctrine has been forcibly expressed in the epigram of Tertullian which is a commonplace in our schools, "*Hæc est summa delicti nolentium recognoscere quem ignorare non possunt.*" Atheism, even where the Christian authority never has prevailed, is a sin against Reason and without excuse.

Strange to say, Mr. Balfour himself admits that such reasoning,—not to the exclusion even of some argument from design,—is "*valid as far as it goes.*" Why, then, does he, almost in the same breath, cast it out on the score of Naturalism ? I think because he has not kept clear definitions before him ; and again, because of his rooted and invincible distrust in Reason when it makes use of positive or real premisses in order to establish Theism directly. His sceptical bent, combined with his religious affections, will just enable him to admit or to lean upon the method "*per impossibile*" which, if it leaves the mysteries of creation where it found them, is, at least, never arrogant, points out the shortest way to a conclusion, and has in view, not the gratification of our speculative inquiries, but practice and virtue. It should, however, be patent to the considering mind that arguments, whether direct or indirect, from principles self-evident or conclusions "*ex absurdo*," address themselves all alike to the reason,—and that individual,—not to prejudice, emotion, use and wont, or feeling and interest. The whole course of proceeding is from truth to truth ; the motives brought forward appear as reasons to the intellect. And their force is such that whosoever

does not reject the principle of causation,—we mean, not the supposed law of inviolable succession, but the axiom, “No change without an adequate cause, no beginning without a sufficient reason,”—or refrains from sophisticating the principle of contradiction, cannot rightly understand the terms of the premisses and refuse his assent to the conclusion grounded upon them.

Surely this manner of arguing belongs to metaphysics, even while it borrows the facts which experience has furnished, or which science in its own degree verifies, and from them, as minor propositions in a rational syllogism, under the light of first principles, goes on to infer that the universe was called into being by creative Thought and Will. If the “real premisses” of such a creed,—which are existence and causation, order in the effects, and the intrinsic necessity of a co-ordinating Mind to produce that order,—do not “lie deep in the nature of things,” what, I ask, does? “Moral intuition, mystical ecstasy?” These too, by all means; but reason likewise. Mr. Balfour speaks in a vague but disparaging way of “our ordinary method of interpreting sense-experience.” Let us be precise, then. The perception of order, the conclusion to purpose, the law which is discernible in particulars, these do not require that we should know by reflective analysis what is the intimate nature of space, time, motion, but only that they exist as undeniable facts. If we apprehend a world distinct from ourselves,—which beyond question we do,—in that world order and succession, causes and effects, collocations resulting in harmonious issues of life and energy, are thereby given. From these we argue; not from a philosophic theory of atoms, or the dynamic speculations of Boscovich, or Lord Kelvin’s smoke-rings. Of all such ingenious theorizings it may be said with reverence, “As a vesture shalt Thou change them, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the self-same, and Thy years shall not fail.” By common experience we know the world as real, and by arguments which spring out of the very essence of our reasoning faculty, we infer the existence, and, in a measure sufficient for the moral governance of conduct, we learn the attributes of its glorious Maker.

“Why, then,” objects the critic of Natural Theology, “if these syllogisms are convincing, do they not convince?” Why,

let me add, has Cardinal Newman—who twice in explicit terms repeats the argument from purpose—affirmed deliberately that “no religion yet has been a religion of physics or philosophy,” and “that it has ever been synonymous with Revelation?” Why does he call it “a message, a history, or a vision,” not “a deduction from what we know” but “an assertion of what we are to believe”? It is rational, if to submit ourselves to authority be such; is it not, therefore, “non-rational,” so far as it goes beyond, or simply never takes into its premisses, the grounds of Natural Theology upon which we have so confidently enlarged?

An illustration from mechanics may fitly serve to introduce our traditional method of answering these questions, more complex—shall I say?—than in themselves difficult. The mechanician who should calculate and contrive his forces to produce a given result without taking account of friction and the resistance of the air, would soon discover that his reckonings, however theoretically perfect, were inexact by omission. Yet the resistance of the air is something external to a machine as such, and friction is an accident, though inseparable from forces in action. The parallel is surely obvious. Man reasons, but he also feels: he can apprehend the truth of a syllogism provided his emotions, or his bias, do not interpose between the meaning of the terms and the mind which ought to make that meaning its own. Passion distorts, interest refracts, prejudice may shut out the light altogether. But still, the light is its proper evidence, and eyes were made to see, although they be kept obstinately closed. Moreover, as Cardinal Newman so admirably says, “Life is not long enough for a religion of inferences”; yet our preoccupations, anxieties, and sensual obstructions need not make those inferences of none effect. They convince in the case where men attend to them, so far as they are simple and elementary. The average mind is never atheistical; it is rarely agnostic; but a long argument takes time, and sophistries may be hard to unravel, and properly to state, even to oneself, the reasons which are most persuasive and irresistible, demands a training which the many do not possess. Last of all, though every syllogism looked at separately may be true both in matter and form, yet the body of doctrine to which they all contribute, and in

which their practical efficiency must be sought, has come down to us by tradition, is recommended by authority, and, except in the rarest instances, would more than task the powers of the mind which attempted, by solitary effort, to build it up on system.

Every word which we have just set down, as applicable to religion in the concrete, is true of mathematics; can it be lawful then, either to reject Newton's astronomy, or to say, that since the millions take it on trust, it is not capable of demonstration? But Natural Theology has this advantage over the "*Principia*," that its great creative axioms, and its most fruitful syllogisms, are within reach of any intellect which can reason from effects to their cause. Hence, while the multitude give assent to the dogmas laid down by authority concerning the existence and attributes of the All-Father, they have a witness in their own minds testifying to the reasonableness of what is taught them. For the ingenious Naturalist may, with Heraclitus, set forth in a rainbow web of sophistries the identity of being and not-being; he may veil from his own vision the juggling by which, given extended particles, and no more, an ordered universe shall arise, with Reason as one of its multifarious products; but the mind, left to itself, recoils from such fever-dreams. It is never among the people at large that a system so contradictory of first principles takes root or flourishes. Theism will always furnish the immediate and spontaneous conclusion to which the human intellect moves. It is in accordance with Reason affirming its own certitudes; and the paralogisms by which it is assailed are an after-thought. "*Veritatis ipsius tanta vis est*," we may surely repeat with Lactantius, "*ut nemo possit esse tam cæcus, qui non videat ingerentem se oculis divinam claritatem*."

Such is the force of unadulterated Reason, to which, also, every line of sound argument in the pages before us bears witness. When empiricists offer as the substance of our knowledge and the ground of experience, causes which being material are blind, or having in them no principle of direction must work at haphazard, or not possessing intellect can never produce it, the light within us shows their inadequacy, pierces through the seemingly non-rational to the only existence that can guide and control it to the results which our eyes and

mind certify, nor stays its progress until for the laws and ideals of right conduct it discovers a moral Deity, for the growth and development of mankind towards artistic perfection a Divine Exemplar, and for the course of history which has brought us on our way a Providence whose name is Love. The fact of evolution, admitted on all hands, points to lines of tendency which have been favoured, to others which in the struggle have not won but lost. From the beginning, then, we know that the scale was weighted on the side of Mind, Virtue, and the Ideal; it is the scale of Unreason that kicks the beam. Have we not thus found ready to our hands an "antecedent probability" of the most splendid sort, proofs accumulating on proofs that if Reason be the will of God it must prevail, and that in the immeasurable world-movement, it has been His will from the first days of creation? Nor is the universe, thus transfigured in the light of intellect, any more a godless machine, grinding on for ever without intent or purpose, the "gloomy Golgotha and Mill of Death" which it could not fail to be, were Naturalism true and not rather the sum of all possible falsehood. There never was, there can never be, a system of powers, terms, or activities, from which the Divine Wisdom could absent itself, or a "State of Nature" the innermost core of which was not Providence "*fortiter suaviterque disponens omnia.*" Not that the presence in man's Reason of the light from Heaven degrades his thoughts to instincts, takes out of self-evident premisses their visible certitude, or need be, strictly speaking, supernatural. It is part of the essence, it follows upon the definition of man as a reasonable creature, that the First and Highest Reason should bear him up in the actions congruous to his very being.

Yet, when we have realised this great and simple truth, we are prepared in the view of our moral failings, of the judgments of conscience, the perplexities which entangle our steps through life, and the need of reconciliation with Him whom we know that we have offended, and who cannot be far from us, to look round with as much hope as trembling, to search into history, and to ask whether He is anywhere visible so that we may turn to Him. As we are free to break the law, despite the uniformities of which science keeps record, so is the Master of the Universe free to manifest both His judgments and His

mercy. Why should He not be free? Are these uniformities sovereign powers, distinct and rival, whose ordinances He, though their Creator, cannot choose but respect? or are they not, rather, modes of the Divine activity shadowed forth in phenomena? The miracles which may thus be interpolated, without violation of any principle of metaphysics, in the course of the world, are so far from being irrational or absurd in themselves that the moral order may well demand them, supposing it please the All-Holy to seal them as credentials upon His message.

The pre-supposition which, when we have arrived at this height, governs our concrete reasoning, is, Mr. Balfour would say, ethical—the need of atonement or reconciliation. Yes, undoubtedly; but we shall take the widest sweep of so grand an horizon if our language becomes more comprehensive still, and we affirm the need of a divine life in man, of a spiritual inner world, the poles of which are faith and charity. For the direct arguments by which we have proved that an Objective Reason exists yield us, at the same time, an inference whereby we know that Reason is moving by choice to its determined ends, and therefore no *Anima Mundi*, unconscious and bound fast in fate, but a self-subsisting Person. To Him we owe much more than recognition; we must worship and obey Him; we cannot choose but desire to hold communion with Him; our life has its secret chambers in which He makes Himself manifest. The intellect which proves Him, the heart which yearns after Him, are faculties of one undivided being that lives “by admiration, hope, and love,” that can never rest in the finite or the phenomenal, and is a mystic by its affections, a citizen of another world than the sensible. To such a mingled nature, earth at once and fire, spirit and flesh, but ascending by some innate law towards the realm where all things are spiritual, Christianity brings its tidings. It holds out the promise of forgiveness; it reveals a pattern of perfection, not merely imagined but incarnate in the Object whom it declares. And it makes Him the beginning of a new and heavenly existence in all who are willing to receive of His spirit. How could miracle or prophecy be omitted from this unearthly scheme? What is the hindrance to either that phenomenal uniformities, never fully observed, and certain

only upon a given hypothesis, can suggest? The presence of God in history which reason insists upon is a fact. That He should reveal Himself more openly, and give sure tokens of the word He is uttering, will always be credible, if He has not become to us an empty name.

These considerations, while they leave room for such details of evidence as the method of Paley would supply, have a power in them (at least for all who believe that there is a divine life and who thirst to partake of it) not unlike that whereby the light of day makes the sun known to us in heaven. We need not exclaim, "Lo, here! and lo, there!" for it shines all round us. The Christian religion, thus contemplated as an objective living system, becomes its own evidence and proof. Historical investigation will be for those who have the leisure and the ability to pursue it, necessary by way of discomfiting unbelievers when they attempt to cast discredit on the written testimony, but in itself of the nature of reflex or critical science, not entering into the substance of faith, or incumbent on the faithful. Yet here again they have a witness, "the sure prophetic word" as it lives and energises within them, and they know in whom they have believed. Their experience is a warrant, individual and intimate, not enabling them to hold arguments with those outside, but dispensing them from the duty of argument. And thus, in Revelation as in the truths of Natural Religion, authority is seen to be no mechanical force pressing on the soul, but a response to its affirmations, a security against dangers, and the multiplied and resounding echo from an actual world of the still small voice which speaks to us in conscience.

Therefore authority, as we may go on to say, adapting certain words of Cardinal Newman, though in such a vast number of cases well founded and reasonable, need not be established upon "investigation, argument or proof; these processes being but the explicit form which the reasoning takes in particular minds," and by no means in all.

For all men possess a treasure of first truths, in virtue of which they come to know whatsoever they do know, says St. Thomas, "*Habitus primorum principiorum, tam speculabilium quam practicorum, qui nulla oblivione vel deceptione corrumpi possunt.*" Thus we may reverence authority, not only

accepting it because we must (which is to imitate the lower creatures ruled by their appetites and instincts), but satisfied when we follow its guidance that reason bids us do so. By whatever way this conclusion be reached, it ceases to be a prejudice or an otiose custom, in proportion as the veracity and the competence of our guide is ascertained. "In januis domorum quis delinquet?" asks the proverb. And St. Thomas explains, applying it to the common sense on which men build their life as on a foundation, "Nam ea per quæ intratur in cognitionem aliorum nota sunt omnibus, et nullus circa ea decipitur." By such evident principles it is that men and women, though neither educated nor philosophical, transform the instinctive need of submission to authority, into a conviction which is reasonable, if not explicitly reasoned out, and which must be termed intellectual despite the absence of conscious logic during its formation.

If the volume which we have been studying could allow of this rational analysis whereby the intellect is shown to be something more than a faculty of drawing inference in mood and figure, its argument would escape the charge, now plausibly brought against it, of scepticism, and we should not feel as we read that Montaigne has said all these things before, with infinite vivacity and eloquence, but to the praise of a dissolving and pernicious doubt, rather than the gain of Christianity. True it is that science, attempting to found itself on the particulars of sense without the principles of reason is utterly delusive. True that Naturalism proceeds by gross and palpable assumptions of which it can never render an account. True, likewise, that authority is the guide of life, beneficent, indispensable, an instrument of progress in art, knowledge, conduct, civilisation. True that to look upon it as a disease of ignorance, a usurpation upon intellect, or a tyranny to be overthrown, is not to grasp the meaning of history or lay the lessons which experience so abundantly yields to heart. True that the atomic theory of the "rights of reason" now widely accepted, which commands every man, woman and child to prove all things by formal logic, discarding presuppositions, and starting with a tabula rasa void of first principles would be insane if it could be acted upon, and is mischievous in proportion as individuals put their faith in it. True, finally, that

the needs of the spirit, ethical and eternal, cry aloud for a system like the Christian Religion, not attenuated into evidences of a long past transaction in remote Palestine, or losing itself amid documentary investigations and the minutiae of criticism, but living, present, effective, the antidote which shall keep man from despising his noblest aspirations since the universe has grown so great and tells him that he is so little. All this we deem true and reasonable. But the foundation on which our apologist thinks he has reared it is not true and will never stand.

It is not, we say with the Catholic tradition—a great and sufficient authority—not true that reason appeals in the last resort to instinct, and goes merely by custom. Not true that natural theology may be analysed into Naturalism, or rests on the same basis of mere phenomena. Not true that Reason following its own process in the individual, without relying upon faith, or calling in trust, or making assumptions on pure hypothesis, finds everywhere around it the prison walls of Fichteism, and is the sole creator, the universal and lonely tenant, of a world which has no reality save the Ego. Not true that we regulate our beliefs by “non-rational impulse,” or that authority destitute of grounds which we apprehend even when we fail to dissect or explain them, supplies to Reason “its most important premisses.” Not true that a “logical nexus” between the things which we hold and the antecedents in the mind on which we hold them, is the sole “intellectual” nexus, or requisite unless “judgments in the sphere of ethics or theology” are to be traced back, in the manner of sense-perceptions, to “non-rational causes.” Not true that our religious convictions are simply instances of biological needs fulfilled, but not of intellect satisfied. Not true that our alternative lies ever between a pious or an incredulous scepticism. And least of all is it true, or can it be allowed by the Christian apologist who will be faithful to his greatest teachers, that the Reason which demonstrates a Personal Living God, just, benevolent, merciful, yet by no means clearing the guilty, a Providence which rewards and punishes in view of Eternal Righteousness, is founded on an act of “trust,” or needs the authority of a church in order to be valid, or is beyond the average power of the human mind, or is an instinct destitute of rational insight.

WILLIAM BARRY.

Science Notices.

The Recent Frost.—At the April meeting of the Royal Meteorological Society, Messrs. F. C. Bayard and W. Marriott communicated some facts of interest concerning the prolonged frost of January and February over the British Isles. This frost has not been equalled in severity since 1814.

The cold period commenced on December 30th, and terminated on March 5th. It was broken by a week's mild weather from January 14th to 21st, otherwise the frost would have lasted continuously for sixty-six days. Between January 8th and 13th temperatures below 10° Fahrenheit, and in some cases below zero, were recorded in parts of England and Scotland. From the 26th to 31st, and from February 8th to 10th the lowest temperatures recorded were—17° at Braemar, and 11° at Buxton and Drumlanrig. The mean temperature of the British Isles for January was about 7°, and for February from 11° to 14° below the average; the mean temperature for the period from January 26th to February 19th was from 14° to 20° below the average. The distribution of atmospheric pressure was almost entirely the reverse of the normal, the barometer being highest in the north and lowest in the south. This accounted for the persistence of strong northerly and easterly winds. During the period rivers and lakes were frozen, the ice being over ten inches thick.

One of the principal public inconveniences caused by the spell of frost was the deprivation of water in the houses all over the country. In some cases householders were without water for over nine weeks. Mains were frozen which were laid as low as 3 ft. 6 in. from the surface of the ground to the top of the pipe. It seems, however, that the nature of the soil was much responsible for the depth to which the frost penetrated.

The effect of the intense cold was disastrous upon the public health, both directly and indirectly through the influenza epidemic, which was fanned into unprecedented severity by the prolonged low temperatures.

Helium.—It seems likely that in the discovery of argon are the foundations for a new and brilliant epoch of scientific investigation.

It has already stimulated the terrestrial discovery of the gas called helium, which Mr. Norman Lockyer observed in the sun's chromosphere in 1868.

Professor William Ramsay has obtained the gas by boiling cleveite, a uranate of lead containing rare earths with dilute sulphuric acid. He filled several vacuum tubes with the gas, and on spectroscopic examination found that argon is present with the helium. On comparing the spectra of an argon-tube with one containing the new gas, he found that while the hydrogen and argon lines in both tubes accurately coincided, a brilliant line in the yellow in the cleveite gas was nearly but not quite coincident with the sodium line D of the argon-tube. Mr. Crookes has measured the wave length of "this remarkably brilliant yellow line." It is 587.49 millionths of a millimetre, and is exactly coincident with the line D³ in the solar atmosphere attributed to helium.

When a strong electric current is passed through a Plucker's tube charged with argon the light emitted is of a strong crimson colour; under the same conditions the light from the helium tube is a brilliant golden yellow. Under a feeble current the argon-tube gives a blue-violet light, the helium tube a steely blue, and then the yellow line is barely visible in the spectroscope. To quote the exact words of Professor Ramsay's recent communication to the Royal Society, "It appears to require a high temperature therefore to cause it to appear with full brilliancy, and it may be supposed to be part of the high-temperature spectrum of helium."

Electric Heating and Cooking.—It is to Mr. R. E. Crompton that the public are indebted for the neat, efficient, and fairly economical contrivances for heating and cooking by electricity.

In 1878 Mr. Lane Fox pointed out that electric cooking could be accomplished by placing the food in a vessel surrounded by a coil of insulated wire, through which an electric current should be passed, but it was only four years ago that his ideas were in any way developed. It was then that Carpenter took out a patent in America for manufacturing electrical heating apparatus, by attaching the resistance wires to the surface of cast-iron plates by an enamelling process. He manufactured a large quantity of culinary apparatus, some of which was exhibited by Messrs. Crompton at the Crystal Palace Exhibition in 1891. Though the apparatus showed the practicability of electric heating, owing to certain defects it was not adapted for long use; for instance, the enamel was found to

crack, and the surface of the wire used was thus exposed to the destructive process of oxidation.

In endeavouring to obviate these difficulties Mr. Crompton has spent a considerable time in looking for a metal which would stand the frequent heatings and coolings to which the apparatus is subject, and which would have a co-efficient of linear expansion nearly the same as that of the enamel used and of the plates to which the wire is attached by these enamels. His experiments resulted in the selection of nickel steel wire; he also replaced the homogeneous enamel used by Carpenter by a composite one consisting of two or more layers, the lower one being of the hardest and most refractory character. The ground work enamel consists almost entirely of silica. This fuses at a very high temperature, being nearly that of the welding point of wrought iron. The nickel wire is applied in the form of a waved or crimped ribbon, the crimping being carried out by a special machine. The crimped ribbon is applied to the surface of the first coat of enamel by means of a "transfer plate." This consists of a metal plate, at the back of which is attached a number of electro-magnets. When the crimped wire has been laid on the plate in any desired pattern or form, the magnets are excited and the wire is held by them firmly in position on the surface of the plate. When it is desired to transfer the wire from the transfer plate to the heated surface of the enamel, the current is withdrawn from the magnets and the wire released.

The first enamel and the wire is then covered up with powdered enamel of a more easily fusible nature than the other, and the temperature of the whole is raised to a degree sufficient to enable the second enamel to melt down and incorporate itself with the upper surface of the first coat of enamel, at the same time completely covering and insulating the wires. The results of this process have proved thoroughly successful, the wire can be heated to any degree required without danger of the enamel cracking. The simplest form of apparatus in which a plate is heated by a current passing through a wire enamelled to its surface is that which is called a heater. It is a circular plate mounted on short legs, to the underside of which wire is applied and fixed by the enamel. The upper side is ground flat and polished. Such a heater is useful in many ways. It can be used as a radiator or as a convenient means of heating dishes, for drying linen, or for warming and drying any article which it may be dangerous to put near a fire. It can be used also for cooking if the food is placed in pans or flat dishes, but it is not advisable to cook in this manner by separate heaters, for there is always a loss from the lower surfaces of the pans

not making sufficiently good contact with the upper surface of the heater. It is wiser to ensure this good contact by making the heating plate form part of the kettle, saucepan, frying-pan, or other utensil.

For measuring the temperatures obtained Mr. Crompton discards the ordinary mercurial thermometer as it is not a reliable means of indicating the temperature of the heated surface, for it really shows the temperature of a stratum of air near the surface instead of that of the surface itself. The instrument adopted was the platinum thermometer invented by Mr. Compton; this measures the temperature by showing the increase in resistance due to the rise in temperature of a delicate coil and platinum spiral placed in close contact with the heated surface. With such an instrument it is possible to take accurate readings, practically simultaneously of the temperature in various parts of an electric oven or other apparatus, and even of various parts of a joint of meat. It is said that in this way a great many interesting facts concerning the cooling of meat have come to light.

It is satisfactory for the public to learn that those who are already supplied with the electric current for lighting their houses, can apply its powers to their kitchen, and even to the warming of their rooms at a cost not so prohibitive as has been prophesied would be the case.

The economical advantages of electric boiling and cooking consist in the direct application of the heat to the water or food at any moment by the simple process of turning a switch, without waste of energy, as is the case in cooking by fires or gas. The percentage of the heat units of the coal burnt in kitchen grates is very small, being something like 2 per cent. This waste is due to the fact that with the exceptions of boiling or stewing, the operations of the cook depend on the radiation of heat instead of conduction. As Mr. Crompton points out, to obtain a radiation fit for grilling a chop, a quantity of coal or coke has to be consumed before a clear grilling fire is obtained, and after the fire is in order some 80 per cent. of the energy goes up the chimney and 16 per cent. is radiated into the room; so it is not difficult to understand why the chop itself does not receive more than 2 per cent. of the total heat units. In the case of an electric griller, however, fully 70 per cent. of the heat energy of the electricity is utilised in the meat.

In cooking by gas the comparison comes out favourable to electricity; for even though in gas cooking the requisite heat can be obtained at the moment required, yet it is imparted to the food by radiation from gas flames, so that it is necessary for a current of air

to continually pass through the oven to secure ventilation and carry off the products of combustion. This ventilating current also carries away something like 80 per cent of the heat units obtained by burning the gas.

The electric oven consists of a rectangular box having double sides at bottom, top, back and front. The inner surfaces of the inner plate form the electric radiators, and the space between them and the outer plates is filled up with a non-conducting material. As the chamber is air-tight no ventilating current of air is necessary, and thus there is no waste of heat. When the oven is filled with food over 50 per cent. of heat energy can be utilised, and though possibly only 5 to 6 per cent. of the heat energy of the fuel is present in the electric energy, 90 per cent. of this or $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole energy goes into the food.

Mr. Crompton claims many advantages for cooking by electricity. The electric kitchen may be as "cool as a dairy," and the cook escapes the continual hardships of being semi-roasted so proverbially trying to the temper of that class of domestics. In the case of the gas oven, the ventilating currents of air dry up, harden, and diminish the flavour of the meat. In the case of electric cooking the stillness of the oven owing to the absence of ventilating currents prevents the drying and hardening action, and the meat comes out tender and juicy right up to the extreme outer surface. Another advantage claimed is the facility for regulating the temperature to any degree of nicety. The electric oven requires no experience to use it successfully, in which point it differs from the ordinary oven, which cannot be properly managed without considerable practice. Mr. Crompton has recently made public the following figures showing the actual cost of the heating of surfaces required for roasting, baking, or frying, for heating surfaces to a lower temperature, such as for warming rooms or airing linen, also for boiling water. To raise a heater plate from 50° Fahr. to 400° Fahr. in half an hour the energy required in B. O. T. units is 0.404, the cost at 4*d.* per unit is 1.61*d.* To raise a radiator plate from 50° to 250° in half an hour the energy required is 0.277, the cost 1*s.* 1*d.* To boil a pound of water in a tea-table kettle in eighteen minutes, the energy required is .075 the 0.32*d.* To boil $\frac{3}{4}$ lb. of water the energy required is .051, the cost 0.2*d.* We can therefore with an electric kettle have a cup of tea at a cost of less than a farthing for a single cup or half a farthing per single cup if several are required.

The advantages of electric radiators have been already appreciated by the management of several theatres. At the Vaudeville Theatre several were used to heat the auditorium last winter, and by their

means the temperature of the theatre was kept fairly constant. The radiators are fixed round the skirting, on either side of the auditorium, and in front of the orchestra. These radiators are of box form, that is they have a front radiation surface studded with projections, fixed in a cast-iron case, which is screwed by means of lugs and insulators to the walls and partition. Each box radiator is 2 ft. long and 1 ft. wide, giving a radiation surface of 2 square feet. The air circulates between the casing and the wall, so that an extra heating surface is available. Besides these fixed radiators, portable ones are used to heat different parts of the theatre before the performance. It is estimated that to warm the theatre for a period of four hours, the cost is 12s. It is probable that a hot-water system would cost as much, while the electric system has the advantage of greater safety from fire.

These recent developments in electric heating mark a new era in electrical developments, and would seem to predict that the existence of an ideal smokeless city is not so very distant. It will probably be realised in the model city at Niagara.

Reflecting and Refracting Telescopes.—Sir Howard Grubb, in his paper recently published in the proceedings of the Royal Institution, discusses the question whether the future increase in the powers of telescopes will be accomplished by refractors or reflectors.

Mr. Alvern Clark, who is famed for his large refractors in the United States, prophesies the triumph of that form of telescope he has so largely developed, but there are many astronomers of an opposite opinion who look to the reflector. Sir Howard Grubb is himself in favour of the reflector, which he thinks capable of great improvement if sufficient attention is directed to it.

He says there is one reason which has been overlooked, but which explains to some extent why the reflector has not been so much developed of late years as has the refractor. It is of a purely economic character. Reflectors are not so costly as refractors, and though it may seem a contradiction to ascribe their neglect to this cause it is easily accounted for. An object glass of 18 inches is worth some £1000, but a mirror of the same size is only worth some £100. To mount the £1000 object glass would cost say £1000; to mount the £100 mirror quite as much would have to be expended, if not more, since there are greater difficulties in mounting a reflector

than a refractor. It is natural that telescope-makers should hesitate in expending a large sum upon what has cost comparatively little.

The difficulties in the mounting of reflectors, especially when required for photographic work, has never yet been satisfactorily solved. About a year ago Dr. Johnstone Stracy introduced an improvement in an ingenious arrangement for supporting the great mirrors of reflectors on an air support, graduating the pressure according to the angle of inclination of the telescope by an automatic contrivance. The value of reflectors has been conclusively shown in the results obtained by the excellent work of Draper, De la Rue, Common and Roberts, but all observers have not the patience to devote equal care on the working of the instrument, and the difficulties in working the reflectors certainly tend to distract the observer's attention from the object in view.

Sir Howard Grubb thinks the fact that the reflector brings all rays of light to a common focus, irrespective of their wave lengths, while the refractor is at best only a compromise, is a very strong argument in favour of the ultimate adoption of reflectors. It is true that experiments have been carried on for some time at the Jena glass manufactory, which may result in producing qualities of glass that will put the refractor on an equality with the reflector in this respect. Such a glass, enabling the telescope to perfectly balance the chromatic error, should at the same time be of a sufficiently permanent character to justify its use in large objectives. Time is the only test of permanence, and even if it were suspected that any specimens of glass had the permanent qualities, no maker of eminence would try the experiment of using it until he knew from experience it had preserved its perfection of surface for twenty or twenty-five years.

The largest optical discs produced are only 40 inches in diameter, but Lord Rosse's reflector of 72 inches diameter is now half a century old. It seems therefore evident that for increased power we must look to the reflector.

With regard to the 8 or 10 feet reflector it is proposed to build for the Paris Exhibition in 1900, Sir Howard Grubb says: "If a monster telescope such as this is to be mounted only in such a manner as will satisfy the ordinary conditions of star-gazing, I fear the results will be disappointing, but let it be mounted in such a manner as to render it useable for the more delicate and refined work of the modern astronomer, and a grand and productive field of work is open to it. But the problem of mounting an enormous instrument such as this, whose weight would probably amount to from 50 to 100 tons, so perfectly poised, and so accurately driven by

clockwork as never to vary from its true position by a quantity greater than the apparent motion of a star in one-twentieth of a second of time, is sufficiently difficult to justify almost a doubt of its possibility."

Flies as Conveyors of Infection.—It has for some time past been suspected by bacteriologists that the ordinary household fly has the very unpleasant habit of carrying about the germs of various diseases. The experiments of Mr. W. T. Burgess have proved that these suspicions were well founded. He put flies in momentary contact with a cultivation of *Bacillus prodigiosus* or some other chromogenic organism, and then let them fly about in a large room for several hours. When caught again they were made to walk over slices of sterile potatoes. After being incubated for some days the potatoes were covered with growths of the organism wherever the flies had walked.

In these experiments harmless microbes were used in case any of the subjects of experiment should escape and be a means of spreading a disease.

It is evident that flies are a continual source of danger, and it is necessary in the interests of health to maintain vigorous means against their intrusion.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

France in Indo-China.—Mr. Henry Norman in his recent book, "The Peoples and Politics of the Far East" (London: Fisher Unwin, 1895), devotes some chapters to the study of French colonisation, from the point of view of its economic results. After an elaborate analysis of the finances of Tongking, of which the official accounts are so manipulated as to be altogether misleading, he comes to the conclusion that in the period 1883-93, it has cost the country the enormous sum of over 530 million francs, or 21 millions sterling, making a yearly average of more than $1\frac{3}{4}$ millions sterling. He puts this result in a popular form by saying that the colony has cost the French taxpayer £4881 a day, Sundays included, for every day it has been in the possession of his country. He then examines the commercial statistics in order to find out if it makes any return in development of trade for this large expenditure, and calculates that that with the mother country has amounted during ten years to an aggregate of no more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling, while that with foreign countries, despite tariff restrictions, has been $7\frac{3}{4}$ millions, so that the protective system as practised there has been a disastrous failure. He sums up the net result as follows :

France has taken possession of a country. She has despatched to it an army of soldiers and a second army of functionaries; a handful of dealers has followed to supply these with the necessities and luxuries of life; the dealers have purchased these necessities and luxuries from France (the foreign imports being chiefly for native consumption), as the Customs tariff prevents them from buying cheaper elsewhere; these purchases have practically constituted the trade of France with the colony.

The whole purpose of the colonial administration seems, from the author's description, to be the annihilation of every form of industrial enterprise, not only on the part of foreigners, but on that of the French colonists, between whom and their own government there always exists, as Prince Henri d'Orleans points out, a latent or overt antagonism. As a natural consequence, the proportion of official to unofficial population is very large, amounting to 1200 out of a total of 1600 Frenchmen, while salaries amount to £360,000, as compared with an expenditure of £16,000 on public works.

Protected Malay States.—The Malay Peninsula is divided by a line separating the native states which acknowledge vassalage to Siam by the annual offering of the *bunga mas*, or Golden Flower, from those under British protection. The latter are five in number, with a collective area of about 27,000 square miles, and population of 400,000. The change in their condition since the introduction of British control, exercised through residents who are nominally the advisers of the Sultans, but really the administrators of the respective States, is characterised by Mr. Norman as “one of the most astounding spectacles in the history of the British Empire.” All the reforms by which their revenues and trade have been largely increased, while their resources have been extensively developed, have been carried out by a handful of European officials directing a native staff, the result being to give them the aspect of British colonies with a population consisting of Malays and Chinese. Roads, railways, hospitals, dispensaries, post offices, telegraphs, sanitary boards, and compulsory vaccination, are among the visible signs of their increasing prosperity. Land, both for mining and agriculture, is being rapidly taken up in districts a few years ago covered by impassable jungle, and 140 miles of railway have been built with a success which may be measured by the payment in the case of one line of a dividend of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Pahang, exhausted by centuries of misrule, is the one exception to the general record of progress, for here, though the condition of the people is much ameliorated by the abolition of the most oppressive forms of tyranny, much yet remains to be done before it is assimilated to its neighbours. The danger to the future of these States arises from the insecurity of their present chief source of wealth, in their alluvial tin mines, which after a limited time must be worked out. To take the place of this precarious industry, agricultural development should be encouraged, as in this direction the fertility of the soil gives great promise of future possibilities. Tea, coffee, pepper, tobacco, and rice would all be remunerative crops, now that the improvement of communications renders possible their transport to a market. Mr. Norman also opines that the present system of administration through residents has had its day, and that some form of combined government or confederation under British rule is required to secure the future of the Protected States.

A Visit to Vladivostock.—Mr. Henry Norman is one of the few Englishmen who have in recent years visited the great naval stronghold of Russia in the Far East. A deep inlet shaped like the

letter L, approached by narrow channels, forms the sheltered and easily defended anchorage termed the Eastern Bosphorus, the "Golden Horn" of the Pacific. The town lies at the foot of the wooded hills enclosing the north side of the harbour, and has a population of 15,000, of whom nearly half are soldiers and officials, while 5000 are Chinese and Koreans, who reside in a separate quarter, and supply all the labour of the settlement. The defences have been enormously strengthened since the last war scare, and the author believes that it is now impregnable from the sea, although parts of the town might be shelled overland. The present restrictive regulations as to the visits of foreign ships of war, limiting their number to two of any one fleet at a time, date from the panic produced among the authorities there on August 21st, 1886, when, in the absence of the Russian fleet, the lifting of a fog disclosed the eight ships of the English Pacific squadron dropping anchor in faultless order in the inner harbour within the batteries. An enemy, by doing this a short time before war was declared, would have the place at his mercy, and with it the Russian naval power on the Pacific. Although the port is closed by ice for four months of the year, from December 17th to April 17th, or thereabouts, there is now an American machine which can plough a channel for ships at any season of the year. In regard to the general position of Russia in the East, Mr. Norman points out the predominance that will be secured to her by the completion, probably within the next ten years, of the Trans-Siberian railway, enabling her alone among European Powers to transport troops in a few days from her western dominions to the Pacific coast. This power of concentration would place her in a position to land an expedition on any point of the Far East before defensive measures could be taken to meet such a contingency,¹ and in order to counteract this increase of strength England ought, in the writer's view, to secure a port on the same ocean a thousand miles further north than Hong Kong, her present outpost in this direction. The ultimate terminus of the Trans-Siberian railway will be, he concludes, at Port Lazareff, a splendid harbour open all the year round.

Cattle Rearing in the Argentine.—The introduction some fifteen years ago of English stock into the Argentine country has revolutionised its cattle industry, by improving the native breed called *criollos*, and enabling them to put on the fat required by the English market. While the best of the *criollo* cattle are now sent

across the Andes to Chile, after being kept on alfalfa in the province of San Juan and Mendoza for some time, a better class of animal with some English blood is shipped to the Brazilian ports, and the fattest beasts to England, after being transferred from the hands of the breeder to those of the *invernador*, who fattens them for the foreign market. The value of live cattle and sheep exported from the Republic in 1894 amounted to over a million sterling, but they did not come up to the standard of English butchers, and fetched lower prices than North American cattle. A syndicate of *invernadores* has now been formed to remedy this inferiority, undertaking to send over cattle to this country in every respect equal to those of their rivals, at £12 instead of £18 per head. The valuable properties of alfalfa (*luzerne*), imperfectly as they are turned to account, give a great stimulus to the grazing business in the Argentine. In one district of 20,000 square miles, from Fortugas in Santa Fé to Rio Cuarto in Corduba, and from Venado Tuerto to the neighbourhood of Fraile Muerto, cattle can be turned into the alfalfa fields and fattened on the crop, which for twenty years requires neither manure or irrigation, and only at the end of that time begins to show signs of exhaustion, being no longer capable of feeding the same amount of stock. The discovery of the capabilities of the alfalfa district is of recent date, as it had hitherto been regarded as one of the most unproductive in the country, incapable of growing nutritious grass or trees of any size. In part it is indeed a complete desert, where rain falls only about three or four times a year. It would now appear that the long roots of the alfalfa, penetrating the loose sandy soil, find water below it at a depth of some 20 feet, rendering the grass independent of rainfall or irrigation. Where the crop is less luxuriant it has to be cut for hay as it does not bear the trampling of animals, and if protected from this source of injury will give five cuttings a year, or about twelve tons per acre. Its fattening properties are due to the nitrogen, which like its congeners of the clover family, it derives from the air.

Korean Export of Ginseng.—The Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society, vol. ix., contains an interesting account of this mysterious root, prized as the sovereign remedy of the Chinese Pharmacopœia, the monopoly of which forms one of the principal sources of revenue in Korea. The virtues ascribed to the plant are rather of a supernatural than of a therapeutical character, as it is believed to be inhabited by a life-giving spirit, and endowed with powers of locomotion which enable it to run away when sought for. The most

prized variety in China is that found in the province of Quantung. Here the quest for it is undertaken under Government auspices by adventurous seekers who start with rations for a fortnight, and the majority of whom are said to perish, either devoured by wild beasts or worn out by fatigue or hunger. Now and again, a favoured individual is permitted to see the spiritual essence which invests the plant with a halo, pointing the spot at which to dig for it when daylight dawns. The highest quality of Korean ginseng, there called "Sam," is the wild mountain variety, the roots of which sometimes grow to a length of four feet. As it is very rare, as much as two thousand dollars has been given for a single specimen. A spurious imitation of the wild species is sometimes raised from seed sown in the forests, but experts are said to be able to tell the difference. The ordinary Korean quality is cultivated on farms under Government supervision, provided with watch-towers to guard the costly crop from the depredations of nocturnal pilferers. The plant, reared from seeds sown in the autumn, flourishes in darkness, so it is always grown in sheds under the shade of screens of matting let down from the roof. It reaches maturity at the end of seven years, when the seeds ripen and the roots are also ready for the harvest. They are taken up, as far as possible, whole, steamed in baskets and dried on bamboo gratings over a fire. In the process they turn red and become clarified. According to popular belief, the effect of the remedy is to render the patient unconscious for three days and ill for a month, after which he recovers and lives in perfect health for ninety or a hundred years. It is a curious coincidence that in America, where ginseng is also found, the Indians have many superstitious beliefs in connection with it, and ascribe to it various curative properties, more especially inherent in every seventh plant gathered.

Captain Younghusband on Chitral.—The Chitral Expedition, whatever its eventual political results, has added largely to our geographical knowledge of a region that has been hitherto almost a *terra incognita*. The triangle of mountainous territory lying between the west bank of the Indus and the north bank of the Kabul river, has never since 1863 been entered by British troops, and had been traversed by but one European, Mr. M'Nair. Chitral itself was little better known, until the arrival of a Russian exploring party from the north called the attention of the Indian authorities to the vulnerability of their outer line of defence in that quarter. Captain Younghusband, whose lecture on it attracted an overflowing audience

to the theatre of the University of London on the evening of March 25th, gained his intimate acquaintance with it in the course of a mission on which he first accompanied Mr. Robertson in January 1893, and then replaced him from May to the end of the year. Under these circumstances, he was in close communication with Nizam-ul-Mulk, the then reigning Mehtar, whose assassination in January last was the beginning of the recent trouble. He describes him as "devoted to hawking, shooting, and sport of every kind, a first-rate polo player, and a man who, though unable to read and write, had plenty of native ability, and was well up in everything that concerned his country, and in the character and history of every man above the lowest in it." He ruled in patriarchal fashion, holding a durbar twice a day, one at eleven in the forenoon, and another at about ten at night. Held in the open, under the shade of some huge plane-tree, with the Mehtar and the English officer seated on chairs, the principal chiefs squatting in a semicircle in front, guards and crowds of natives in the background, and the ever present snowy peaks closing the distance, these primitive courts of justice formed scenes characteristic of Eastern life and manners. Not only all the affairs of the country, but its gossip and scandal as well, were discussed there, and each disputant, after kissing the Mehtar's hand or foot, pleaded his suit in person, while judgment was usually given after consultation with the elders of his village. All the leading inhabitants of Chitral are expected to reside in the capital, and assist in the Government by attendance at the durbars, &c., for two months of every year, during which time they are the guests of the Mehtar; and as some of the lower classes have also to serve as his guards and attendants for a like period, he comes into personal contact with most of his subjects, and becomes known to them in turn.

Character of the People of Chitral.—In accompanying the Mehtar on a tour through his dominions, the English visitor had an opportunity of mixing familiarly with all grades of the inhabitants, and found them impulsive and warm-hearted, with many lovable traits, as well as many tiresome ways. They are greedy of presents, and very jealous of those bestowed on others, and are great lovers of sport, shooting and hawking forming the universal recreations, and sharing in popularity with polo which is played by old and young, men of sixty seeming just as keen about it as their junior competitors.

They are capable [said the lecturer] of becoming very warmly attached to British officers, and General Lockhart is a god amongst them. He

appears to have gained their hearts by making jokes. They love a joke. It need not be a very deep one, but such as it is it will be received with shouts of laughter and repeated for years afterwards.

Mountainous Aspect of Chitral.—"A sea of mountains" is the phrase used to describe the country, as seen from the summit of a peak overhanging its capital. A skeleton land of bare brown rock, its sterility is relieved only by patches of green at the bottom of the narrow valleys, while the element of sublimity is supplied by the snowy ranges culminating in the great mass of Tirich Mir, 25,000 ft. high. The little villages with their tiny domains, the largest, that of Chitral itself, only three miles long, are described as wonderfully beautiful, with orchards and green fields, studded with mulberry, walnut, apricot, and plane-trees, the effect being enhanced by the dreariness of the scenery the traveller has previously ridden through.

Chitral after the War.—The *Times* correspondent, who accompanied the expedition, and pushed on ahead of it for the last 44 miles, found these lovely and smiling villages almost deserted by their inhabitants, in consequence of the devastations of the allied chiefs, Umra Khan and Sher Afzul, as well as from fear of the British advance. While everything they possessed had been carried off by the native freebooters, a report had been spread that the British were about to burn every village and massacre all the inhabitants, as retribution for the attack on their officers. All along the road to Chitral the same experience was repeated, and scattered hamlets surrounded by shade and verdure were found abandoned, or occupied by terror-stricken inhabitants. Chitral itself is situated in a valley fenced in with high mountains, and the now historic fort is seen nestling amid giant plane trees. The valley is sprinkled with tiny villages and covered with trees, offering a striking contrast to the barrenness of its enclosing hills. The great skill shown by the besiegers was due to the experience of Umra Khan's troops in siege operations, as his native country, Bajaur, is studded with miniature forts two or three to the square mile, and he was noted for his success in capturing these little strongholds. At Chitral consequently, the stone breast-works called *sangars* were thrown up in regular parallels, a mine was scientifically constructed, large scaling-ladders were prepared, and ammunition was so carefully economised that not a shot was wasted, every cartridge being accounted for to the commanding officer.

British Somaliland.—The British Protectorate on the Somali coast is a model dependency as regards its financial administration, since its revenue largely exceeds its expenditure. The necessity for its occupation arises from its proximity to Aden, which its coast line of 300 miles directly faces, and which derives from it the bulk of its supply of meat. A letter of Mr. Curzon's, published in the *Times* of February 16th, describing his visit to it on his return from the Indian frontier, furnishes us with the latest information regarding it. A land which, though not apparently rich or fertile, is capable of supporting large herds of cattle, sheep, and goats, it is one of the few great game preserves left in Africa, and has recently supplied a new species of giraffe with the tawny brown of its hide intersected by narrow white lines instead of the irregular spots with which it is dappled in the older variety. Its inhabitants are that fierce and warlike race whose strange passion for surgical operations brought them constantly to Captain James's camp to be cut and slashed by the doctor, as they liked, they said, "to feel steel." They were at that time equally willing to treat others to the same sensations, and were considered a treacherous people. Those within the radius of the British authority have, however, settled down peaceably, and are so thoroughly broken in that it is thought it may be soon possible to withdraw the handful of Indian troops that keep order along the seaboard, and entrust the task to the native militia, including a small but very efficient Somali camel corps. The popularity of British rule is not to be wondered at, since it furnishes employment to hundreds on public works, supplies hospitals, schools, and dispensaries gratis, and distributes unstinted relief in time of famine. Its judicial machinery inspires increasing confidence in the tribesmen, who have learned to trust an Englishman's word so completely that his name on a scrap of paper to be cashed at Aden will be unhesitatingly accepted as a substitute for money hundreds of miles from the coast, where only hard cash would be taken from any other foreigner. The Somali race is supposed to be a mixed one, derived from the intermarriage of Arab immigrants with the Galla tribes. The men are slenderly built, without the powerful physique of the negro, but have great hardihood and endurance. Their dress consists of a white sheet draped over the shoulders, while yellow clay rubbed into their frizzy locks gives them the golden hue demanded by fashionable taste. The principal ports are Berbera, Bulhar, and Zeyla, the former, with a population of 30,000 during the trading season, being the capital and chief emporium. A group of white-washed buildings on a yellow beach constitutes the official and mercantile quarter, while the native settlement is formed of grass huts as closely packed together as the authorities will permit.

NOTES OF TRAVEL AND EXPLORATION.

Behind the settlement thus constituted [says the letter] a hot and sandy maritime plain, thinly speckled with mimosa and other scrub, extends inland, gradually rising towards the first and lower mountain ranges, which, at distances varying from 2 to 20 miles from the coast, lift an arid sandstone formation to a height of from 500 to 1000 ft. Then ensue long stony and jungly plains, after crossing which, for 30 miles or more, the main *ghats* are reached, a fine mountain range tree-clad and culminating in peaks 7000 ft. high. Such is the almost uniform panorama of the Somali coast.

French Protectorate on the Bay of Tadjura.—The adjoining French protectorate was also visited by the correspondent, who was courteously received by the authorities. The port of Obok has been abandoned since 1887, for the superior harbour of Jibuti on the southern coast of the Gulf of Tadjura. A jetty has been made of stones and rubble, and the subsidised steamers of the *Messageries Maritimes* call there, but the trade is small. A miniature Decauville railway runs inland for a few miles, from the pier to the fort that guards the water supply of the town.

Notices of Books.

Retraite Pascale d'après les grands Prédicateurs Contemporains. Par M. L'ABBÉ PLUOT. Paris: T'équi. 1895.

A NEW edition of the Abbé Pluot's "Retraite Pascale" affords us an opportunity of calling attention to a remarkable and useful book. The compiler of this collection of present-day sermons on eternal verities is a priest who has had great experience in the ministry. An attentive and sympathetic study of the needs of our age has fitted him for judging what remedies and what physicians are best calculated to lead the sick and weary souls of Christians back to health and energy. Thanks to his thorough and practical knowledge of shorthand, the Abbé has been able to follow the eloquent discourses of some of the very best French preachers. Of these sermons he has chosen those best suited to his immediate purpose, and arranged them, after the so-called Ignatian pattern, in the order of a retreat. These spiritual exercises, though they are called "Retraite Pascale," may be used with profit at any season of the year.

Besides the usual retreat instructions there are thoughtful sermons on "The restlessness of human life," "Delaying Conversion," "Easter Duties," "We must love the Church," "Zeal of Souls," &c. These and the more hackneyed subjects are treated with freshness, life, and variety by well-known French orators. The names of Cardinal Caverot, Canon Bretter, Father Monsabré, O.P., and other distinguished preachers, are guarantees of the merit locked up in the sermons contained in the Abbé Pluot's compilation. Here and there in the volume edifying examples are interspersed which rather detract from the value of a serious work. Tastes differ, but to an English palate most of the *traits historiques* seem to possess the insolidity and cloying sweetness of comfits. Fortunately, these pale imitations of extinct Sunday-school literature are few and far between.

Reasonableness of Cathoic Ceremonies and Practices. By Rev. J. J. BURKE. Second edition. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1894.

THIS little work, we are told in the preface, was originally issued in the form of two small pamphlets, "The Reasonableness of the Ceremonies of the Catholic Church," and "The Reasonableness of the Practices of the Catholic Church." The first edition having been disposed of, the author has deemed it advisable to unite the two pamphlets in one small volume. The principal object in preparing these papers has been to explain (for the benefit of those unable to procure more complete works) some matters much misunderstood by non-Catholics, and often undervalued by the children of the Church. By the *Practices* of the Catholic Church Father Burke means those devotions and usages characteristic of her. Hence, in these pages he does not treat of religious observances common to all Christians; but only those that are especially Catholic. The meaning of Ceremonies, their impressiveness, and their agreement with the twofold element in man's nature are first considered. The objection taken from John iv. 24, is met and answered in words which give an epitome of the larger work, "In spirit and in truth." Our old friend Fr. Glover, O.S.B., and his invaluable explanation of the ceremonies of the Mass comes back to our mind as we examine with Father Burke the meaning of the vestments worn by the celebrant and the reasons for using Latin during the august Sacrifice. Cardinal Newman's beautiful and ever-welcome words on the Holy Mass bring the first part of this volume to a fitting conclusion. Two-thirds of the book are devoted to the *Practices* of the Catholic Church. Vespers and Benediction are the first treated. The rite of Benediction is explained, and everything connected with it is shown to be "reasonable, beautiful, and suggestive of the noblest sentiments of the heart of man." The Blessed Sacrament receives further and more precise treatment in succeeding pages. Confirmation, confession, indulgences, veneration of our Blessed Lady are dwelt upon briefly, but in words which reveal the well-read theologian as well as the popular speaker. After speaking of prayers for the dead and prayers to the saints, the author takes up the subject of sacramentals, and here, we think, he is at his best. Few Catholics will rise up from reading Father Burke's short, pithy paragraphs on the Sign of the Cross, Holy Water, Candles, Palms, &c., without having learnt something profitable both to themselves and to those without who may inquire about these things. Clergymen having converts to instruct will find these pamphlets exceedingly

useful. They are admirable for their brevity and clearness. Points known already come out more distinctly in these pages, and all the subjects are set forth in a manner to bring home to the heart of every dispassionate reader the truths that underlie the ceremonies and practices of the Infallible Bride of Christ.

The Great Problem of Substance and its Attributes, involving the Relationship and Laws of Matter and Mind as the Phenomena of the World derived from the Absolute.
 London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road. 1895. Pp. 197.

THE following extract is taken from the author's preface:—

If I may be permitted to call attention to some of the specialities which characterise this publication, I would mention the following. The inherent attributes of primitive and essential substance have been eviscerated; for substance without attributes is a contradiction in terms. The expressions, spirit and matter, have been respectively defined, while their consanguinity and connection have been traced to what is obviously their natural source. The great bugbear of the age, that of materialism as itself the direct foundation of mind, has been relegated to its proper province. The precise source and foundation of physical forces, and the laws whereby they have their play in the economy of nature, have been pointed to, as determined in circumstances consistent with universal experience. The basis of life, that is, of natural law in the vegetable and animal spheres, as well as in the mineral kingdom, has been duly manifested; and the great law of causality, as an all-pervading principle in the wonderful chain of existing conditions, has been fairly analysed and formally promulged.

The above is a very fair sample of the anonymous author's work, which is dim, misty, shadowy, and, so far as we can see, calculated to serve no good purpose whatever.

Outlines of Dogmatic Theology. By SYLVESTER JOSEPH HUNTER, of the Society of Jesus. Volume I. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1895. Pp. 525.

WE welcomed the announcement that a course of Dogmatic Theology in English was to appear. Such a work was badly needed, for nothing of the kind existed. An English version of a well-known Theology was indeed commenced a few years ago, but unfortunately, for whatever reason, it was never carried into the second volume. Moreover, it was understood that the new Dogmatic Theology was to issue from the Jesuit press, and, after the extremely

able series of philosophical manuals which had been published by the Jesuit Fathers, this seemed to be a guarantee of a very high order of excellence. In consequence it was with a distinct prejudice in its favour that we sat down to read the first volume of the "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology." But we are bound to say that we concluded our reading with a sense of disappointment. That the book is a useful one we freely admit. Where there is no competition anything is useful. But that it is likely to become and to remain a standard work we can scarcely believe. We doubt if we can allow the "Outlines" the merit of being a good work from even the literary point of view. That the style is easy, and flowing, and clear is undeniable. But each subject calls for its own special style, and we cannot think that the style of the "Outlines" is suitable to the treatment of Dogmatic Theology. One of the aims which the writer proposes to himself is to enable the reader "to realise how closely the various parts of theology are linked together." If the author's style were more nervous and concise, if his book were really more after the manner of an outline, Fr. Hunter would have better effected his purpose. The book is easy to read, but it is not easy to carry away, and it is not easily seen as a whole. Fr. Hunter states that he has followed in the arrangement of his treatises the "admirable Compendium of Father Hurter." We wish that our author had followed Hurter even still more closely. We wish that he had contented himself with giving us the skeleton and framework of Hurter's Compendium which well deserves to be called admirable. He would then have accomplished his desire of presenting us with a work which would enable us to see Theology as a whole and to retain a clear and distinct recollection of it. He would have avoided discussing at length such questions as that of the temporal power of the Popes, which do not usually find a prominent place in dogmatic text-books, and would have devoted the space thus saved to the further elucidation of points that are more unquestionably dogmatic. But where there is no choice we cannot afford to be particular. So, for the present, and till something better appears, we must do our best to feel grateful to Fr. Hunter for the first volume of his "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology."

Cardinal Franzelin, S.J. *A Sketch and a Study.* By the Rev. NICHOLAS WALSH, S.J. Dublin: Gill & Son. 1895.

WHEREVER theological learning is sheltered: wherever it is regarded as a science of profound depth, working on scientific principles of its own, wherever the brain is duly cultivated, and a solid volume of learning is welcome, wherever miserable epitomes are repudiated and the administration of theology in homœopathic doses invisibly small condemned, there the name of Franzelin will be held in due honour. That the Jesuit Order has been the friend of learning nobody will deny with an intelligent and honest countenance. That theological learning has found a refuge in their halls, and still finds a congenial home among that learned community—and that their great Chair in the Gregorian University in Rome when held by Franzelin had not its glory dimmed by its occupant, is a statement which will receive universal assent. Of all the sciences theology is the noblest—it deals with revelation scientifically. Its premises are certain, its logic cogent, its conclusions irresistible. Viewed in substance its matter is the highest, its motives the surest, its convictions the firmest of all the sciences. It is prolific in kindred sciences. It gives knowledge to the intellect, piety to the will, warmth to the heart, and purity to the affections. Touching the intellect it gives us truth; touching the soul it gives us morality. In a wider range, if you view it as a subject of Belief, you have Dogma; as a subject guiding Act you have Morals; as a system of Ethics legally sanctioned and working along the lines of community and social life you have Canon Law; as a force permeating the minds of men, and manifesting itself as a power among men, nations, and tribes, you have Ecclesiastical History, all sciences closely intertwined, so much so that to be an expert in one, it is necessary to cultivate the others.

When such is the character of the science to be taught it will be readily seen the kind of scholar that it takes to make a really good Professor of Theology—and this was the scholar that the students of the Gregorian University had in Franzelin. We feel tempted to think that had we such a man as Franzelin in England what would we do with him? Perhaps send him into a seminary to teach half-a-dozen raw youths Bishop Hay's "Sincere Christian." We are suffering an unknown loss in men, in money, in bricks and mortar, and in the inefficiency of the work done by the deplorable decentralisation of ecclesiastical education. It seems to be the easiest thing in the world to man with Professors an establishment where the ecclesias-

tical sciences are taken in and done for, while we maintain that the most difficult problem about the matter is to raise a really good first-rate body of learned and devoted men whose opinion would carry weight both at home and abroad, and who would be capable of raising the standard of learning, and giving our students the highest degree of mental and moral training that, humanly speaking, they are capable of receiving. When we remember Cardinal Franzelin with his 300 odd theologians listening to him, and his successor, Cardinal Mazzella, with nearly 450 under perfect control in one class, and then turn round and see at least ten men engaged in teaching fewer men, and in teaching them considerably worse, we may safely wonder at the wisdom of waste, decentralisation, and inefficiency which we can ill afford. Given the Professor, it is as easy to teach 300 men as 30.

Franzelin's reputation rests on his characteristics as a Professor and as a Theologian with a method and style of his own, and we fear that this salient point in his character Father Walsh has failed to bring out. Not that the book is not pervaded by a serious spirit and possesses many good points, but it has some serious defects, not the least being a tendency to give us an odd chapter on Ascetic Theology here and there, where a passing glimpse would suffice in a life. Pages of Spiritual Perfection are all right in Rodriguez, but in reading a life it is important not to give prolix disquisitions on the virtues, &c., with which our subject was ornamented. For instance, we have seven pages (pp. 29–36) on the "State of Life"—again, a similar series of moral reflections, extending from p. 48 to p. 64—again, from 113 on several pages—again, from 132 to 138, and, again, from 158 to 173—all *ex professo* disquisitions on the spiritual life and piety in general. The result is that his Eminence disappears to turn up again later on. These are practically all the drawbacks of moment in the arrangement, but it must be said that a general impression remains that the striking personality of Cardinal Franzelin in the academic arena of the nineteenth century is not brought out as well as the great Cardinal's admirers could wish. We hope that several interested classes will read the book carefully—Bishops, so that they may see the style of man capable of training their ecclesiastical students; Professors, who may learn what their position is capable of; Students, who may learn piety and perhaps humility at their shortcomings, especially if they cannot devour Greek texts from the *Patrologia Græca* during their walks, and when recovering from a fit of sickness at eighteen, race through the old Bible in Hebrew without the points as a mild form of relaxation; in fine, the whole of our reading public, that they

may be edified by a holy and humble life of the greatest theologian of the nineteenth century.

Chant Grégorien : Grammaire Élémentaire. Par l'Abbé C. CARTAUD. Solesmes : Imprimerie Saint-Pierre. 1895. Pp. 128.

THE title of this little work may not serve to give every one a correct notion of its contents. The word "grammar" as applied to the Gregorian Chant, has not yet acquired a fixed meaning. With our author (and we think rightly) it does not necessarily include any treatment of the Liturgical Books, nor even of the construction of the Church modes, nor of their transposition, nor does it comprise anything more than the merest allusion to the accompaniment of the chant. Grammar, strictly speaking, deals with the words of which language is composed, and with the laws that govern it. If we apply it to the subject in hand, grammar expounds the principles and rules for reading and singing the text of the sacred offices of the Church. It is in this sense that our author employs the term. His treatise is divided into two parts, to which is added a supplement of examples.

In Part I. the elements which go to make up a sentence, and the manner of its oral expression in reading, are analysed with considerable care and penetration. We are led on through *letters*, *syllables*, *words*, and their *accentuation* to *phrases*, complete and incomplete.

In Part II. the different elements into which the written or spoken sentence is resolved are shown to have their exact counterpart in the melodies of the chant. The chant has its letters (*notes*), syllables (*groups of notes*), words (*groups of musical syllables*), and phrases (*groups of musical words*). The comparison here drawn out is no ingenious and artificial arrangement. It goes to the very root of the construction of the Gregorian song, and supplies the only rational basis for its true interpretation. The writer makes no claim to be a discoverer. His one object is to popularise the larger works of men like Dom. Pothier, Dom. Schmitt, P. Lhomeau, and others. He has followed somewhat closely the "*Méodies Grégoriennes*" of Dom. Pothier, but never to the abandonment of his own system and individuality. His clear conception of the view he is setting forth, his accurate and incisive statement of principles, his constant and patient application of the rules of good reading to the execution of the chant, his insistence on those points that tell most in the rendering of a piece, the twofold setting of all his examples

in Gregorian and modern notation, his judicious employment of the marks of expression, the unmistakable clearness of the examples that are worked out in his supplement, make the book an important addition to the literature of this subject.

The present work is the sequel to one brought out by the same author in 1893 (*Chant grégorien. L'édition bénédictine et les diverses éditions modernes*), in which the rules elaborated by Dom. Pothier for the execution of plain chant were adapted to recent editions, other than that of Solesmes. Now, however, he has produced an elementary manual especially designed to promote the true interpretation of the Benedictine edition. Still, as the bulk of the principles and rules that come under treatment are of a general character, the book will prove a valuable aid to the proper rendering of the authorised Roman edition.

H. P.

La Liberté. Première partie. Historique du problème au XIX^e Siècle. Par l'Abbé C. PIART. Paris: Lethellieux. 1894. 12mo. Pp. 351.

THE Abbé Piart, Professor at the Institut Catholique of Paris, has given us a very useful work on the subject of the controversy respecting the freedom of the will. His treatise is in no sense a compilation, it is a serious and original study of opinions. It is a history, but not simply a record. It is a systematic, accurate, and thoughtful exposition of typical views for and against liberty, which have been propounded by leading men since the time of the French Revolution. The author confines himself to the nineteenth century, and deals mainly with the writings of philosophers of the French and German schools. At first sight it might appear that he has attached too little importance to the position taken up by the two Mills, and Dr. Bain; but the wider horizon which he opens out only serves to display the narrowness and comparative insignificance of our English school of Sensism, when viewed as part of the great field of controversy over which the issues involved in the discussion of human liberty have been contested. The ground of the conflict is mapped out into three primary sections: 1. The Reaction against the materialism of the eighteenth century, which produced Eclecticism in France and Transcendentalism in Germany. The tendency of these two schools was in the direction of liberty. 2. The determinism which was the outcome of the success and exclusive methods of physical science. But in proportion as one or other element in the

factors of human activity received undue emphasis, the character of the denial of liberty was changed. Thus Comte, Mill, and Spencer are classed as types of the school that denies the freedom of the will on the strength of reasons drawn from physical science—Richet, Bain, Taine, Garofalo and Maudesley are presented as four divergent types of the opinion which assails liberty on the ground of the close connection between, or rather the substantial identity of the psychic and the organic. Schopenhauer and Fouillée are cited as two widely different instances of thinkers who refuse to admit liberty on grounds purely psychological. Not the least interesting section is the last, in which the reaction of the Neo-critical school in favour of liberty is exemplified in the Swiss philosopher, M. Secrétan, and in the French writer, M. Renouvier. The various theories are handled in a manner which, while it is uniform, never becomes in the slightest degree wearisome. Each view is introduced with its historical setting, and expounded by well-chosen extracts and summaries, for which references are supplied in the notes. The position of the author is exactly defined, and the arguments he adopts are worked out with some detail. The way in which the several schools dealt with current proofs or disproofs is carefully shown, and the efforts made by successive theorists to bring their pronouncements into agreement with the facts of consciousness, the moral dictates, the laws of universal causation, conservation of energy or persistence of movement, are worked out with considerable skill and patience. The exposition of an opinion is followed by some brief and spontaneous criticism of its salient features.

The detailed and orderly investigation of hypotheses so radically incompatible as those which form the subject of this work, reveals, as nothing else would, their narrowness, their dogmatism, and the inability or unwillingness of their patrons to grasp views opposed to their own. But while, taken as a whole, these opinions are mutually destructive, it is not to be inferred that the exponent of Catholic truth will discharge to the full the obligation laid upon him, unless, he enters seriously and generously into those difficulties, which have seemed decisive proofs to men who have adopted the wrong solution of one of the gravest of human problems. We are of opinion that the arguments for liberty drawn from the facts of consciousness may receive a still keener edge, the response of the agent to the external motives by which it is solicited admits of still finer analysis, the area of free action requires more precise definition than it has yet received, the modifications and hindrances of liberty, the *impedimenta liberi*, even at this period of their scientific explanation, will bear an elucidation more real, living, and psychological than is found in the

ordinary manual, the distinction and correlation of the psychic, organic, and mechanical, or muscular elements in willing, require to be exhibited in a form which shall effectually dispel the confusion of current error, the intellectual element in a free act demands more distinct emphasis in our explanations of its nature, and the anti-impulsive effort, so ably treated by Dr. Ward in the pages of this REVIEW, should receive most careful exposition. In the privacy of some small philosophical class, the well-worn stock arguments may be accepted as sound and satisfactory, but minds have so to be disciplined as to be capable of grasping the idiosyncrasy of an opponent's view, and the arguments employed must be so pointed and weighted, as to hit and destroy the error against which they are directed.

The critical touches of the Abbé Piart lead us confidently to believe that, in the second volume of his work, he will manipulate the old weapons in a manner worthy of the skill he has shown in the delineation of doctrines that are wholly or in part erroneous.

Where there is so much that is excellent, it seems ungracious to find fault, still we cannot but regret the total absence of an index, or a comprehensive table of contents. Possibly the defect of index will be supplied in the next volume. Again, the references given in the footnotes leave much to be desired. In these active times, citation by chapter, by lesson, or still more by the mere title of a book or article, will by most readers be deemed somewhat inadequate. It also appears to be a defect in a work of this description that the dates of writers who are brought up for treatment, and the precise time at which they wrote, are not generally given. It must, however, be understood that blemishes such as these do not affect the general excellence of the production. The diction throughout is clear and copious. There is not a dry page in the book, nor is there one that falls below the dignity of a philosophical treatise. He describes the spirit of the school of Kant and his successors as "*une sorte de débauche métaphysique*," p. 73. Elsewhere referring to the same school, he says, "*En France on ne dépassait que timidement la frontière des phénomènes . . . en Allemagne, au contraire, on se jétait à toutes voiles dans l'absolu*," p. 99.

Within the limits of a notice there is little room for extracts, and it must suffice to have instanced, as samples of delicate and masterly criticism, the author's comments on Jouffroy, p. 68, on the Eclectics, pp. 101-3, on Schelling, p. 105, on Comte, p. 130, on Fouillée, p. 249, on Secrétan, pp. 290-291.

Some may complain that M. l'Abbé Piart has thrown himself even too generously into the position of the figures of his history. He

finds excellences where others would discover only deficiencies and shortsightedness. Maine de Biran is for our author "un immortel psychologue," p. 15: "le plus grand psychologue de notre siècle. Jouffroy is "cette figure à la fois noble et méditative," p. 50. Schelling is "un génie trop peu connu," p. 76, "une grande âme et d'une puissante intelligence," p. 95, "il a laissé sur le problème qu'il a remué des aperçus nouveaux, qu'il faudra désormais en tenir compte. Il s'est mis par là au rang des plus grands philosophes." *Ib.* Frank recognitions like these cannot be construed into any approval of the portentous errors into which great minds have been betrayed; while besides being an honest tribute to the existence of real natural gifts, they may do something to secure a considerate hearing from men who count themselves as disciples of our great modern philosophers. We feel convinced that this work will well repay the careful study of all those who are interested in the grave problem, whose recent history it unfolds.

H. P.

Summa Syntaxica cum thematis ad exercendum. Auct.
MARIO LAPLAND, Soc. Jes. Sac. Friburgi-Brisg. 1894.

THIS is a thoroughly practical exercise-book for teaching Latin composition. In the first part are given the principal rules of Latin Syntax, stated as concisely as possible, and illustrated by well-chosen examples. The second part consists chiefly of passages from various Latin authors, graduated in difficulty, for translation and dictation. The compiler has in some cases made the constructions easier for the youngest students on the principle that *nutrices cibum prius mandunt molliuntque, quam infantibus in os inserant*. It may be remarked as an advantage that the examples and selections are not confined to the authors usually read in England and called *par excellence* "classical," but we find passages from such authors as Gellius, Celsus, Mela, Florus, Vitruvius, and Palladius. Consequently the constructions are not confined to the "best period" of Latin, *e.g.*, *dicam quod* with *indic*, occurs as an example. The division of the subject also differs from ours in some respects. What we call *oratio obliqua* appears here under the heading *De oratione subjunctiva*, while the various uses of the subjunctive in adverbial clauses are here classified under the heading *De ceteris orationis modis*, and divided into *modus finalis*, *modus causalis*, &c.

Short Practical Sermons for Early Masses, &c. By Rev. G. F. WOLLGARTEN. St. Louis, Mo.: Berthold & Co. 1894.

IN a few centuries from now the ecclesiastical historian who deals in minute things will note the rise and development in the end of the nineteenth century of the five-minute sermons, and will doubtless formulate a theory regarding the exigencies of life, which demanded such a literary product, and will presumably note the prevalence of "essences" and "extracts," and *multum-in-parvos*. In all ranks the pressure is keen, and the clergy, who keep penny banks, and soup-kitchens, and are members of school boards and boards of guardians, and preside at Healthy Homes Societies, and organise school treats and trips, and parochial gatherings, and charity sermons, and bazaars, and finance a mission, and compile form ix. and adjust differences, and keep everybody and everything in order, and glance at their daily paper, and carefully con over their daily breviary, and do a thousand and one things about half-a-dozen confraternities, &c., will find little time to do the work of preaching the word of God. Hence a handy sermon, brief, pithy, with a couple of salient points which he can seize, and develop at the shortest notice, is a God-send, as it may be a question of no sermon, or a sermon that is no compliment to the office of preacher, or the intelligence and piety of the faithful. Hence we welcome the *Repertorium*—Sermons from the Flemish—Gahan was famous as a set preacher, but we live in five-minute times—and the present two volumes. They are helps, with, of course, the general tendency of stifling thought and originality, but that cannot be helped; they are useful for the preacher, useful as meditation, useful as spiritual reading, but spiritual reading among our laity is not regular. Hence we recommend these short sermons. In a Church with masses following at each hour, one of them can be used with good effect. One good and fruitful point driven home, and the three early masses in average parochial church can have their short sermon to instruct those who rarely hear a sermon, and to rouse the torpid by a few pithy and incisive sentences. These Sermons answer the purpose well; they are short, they are moral and didactic, and thus warm the heart and enlighten the mind. We recommend them to the clergy as being suggestive, and hope they will in many quarters aid our priests to speak with advantage to their flocks. Men will always listen, and these two handy volumes will equip many a preacher to instruct and edify, when left to himself he perhaps would only partially succeed in doing either.

Histoire de Lescure, ancien fief immédiat du Saint-Siège et de ses Seigneurs. Par l'Abbé HENRY GRAULE. Paris : Tequi. 1895. 8o. 3e. édition. Prix 4 fs.

THIS bulky volume of 758 pages is the historical record of a village situated on the right bank of the Tarn, about two miles above Albi. It was written by the Curé at the instigation of the late Archbishop, who, desirous of compiling materials for the civil and religious history of his diocese, requested each of his parish priests to furnish him with full details of their respective parishes. If this book be a specimen of similar labours, the "*Albia Christiana*," designed by Mgr. Ramadié, will be—if ever completed—a monumental work of the utmost importance. The Société Archéologique of Toulouse, to mark their appreciation of the value of his painstaking toil, has awarded one of its first prizes to the author.

Castellum Scurial—the strong fortress and lordship of Lescure—was brought as part of her *dot* by Constance of Toulouse to her husband King Robert, and was given by him to his old teacher, the learned monk Cerbert, who ascended the pontifical throne as Sylvester II. in 999. Sergius IV. granted the fief in 1012 to the first seigneur of Lescure—Védian I.—for an annual rent of 10 sols to be paid to the bishops of Albi, who were entrusted with its collection. From this date Canon Craule has recorded the history of the fief and its owners down to the present day. It is interesting to observe how the Popes cared for and protected this tiny territory when any necessity arose for their intervention. Their various bulls are given in full. Innocent III. confirmed the possession of Lescure to its seigneurs, and nominated, as arbitrator, of any difference between them and the inhabitants, their metropolitan the Archbishop of Bourges. Various privileges were granted to the free tenants, who thereupon swore fidelity to the Papal see. Clement IV. confirmed their rights in 1268. John XXII. in 1328 forbade the seneschal of Toulouse to construct a new bastide, or free town, in the King's interest, in the neighbourhood of Lescure, to the prejudice of the vassal of Rome. Sicard III., with some other nobles, incurred a sentence of banishment from the realm and the confiscation of their goods in 1366, when Lescure was given by the King to his chancellor. But Sicard appealed to Rome, and Gregory XI. effected a reconciliation between the Crown and his liegeman, who had, however, to pay a heavy fine. This so crippled his resources and means of defending his castle, that Lescure soon afterwards fell into the hands of the English, who retained possession until driven out by Duguesclin.

Pierre II. (1422-1450) strongly fortified the place against the attacks of the Free Companies—originally launched against the country by the Black Prince—but it was taken and held for three years by Rodrigo de Villandranda, who also captured Albi (1436) on behalf of Robert, of the house of the Dolphins of Auvergne and Bishop of Chartres, at that time the competitor of Bernard de Casilhac for possession of the see of Albi. Lescure was captured by the Huguenot forces in 1581, and held by them for four years, during which time they ravaged all the country around Albi, but failed to take that city. They burnt the castle on leaving it. From fear that the place might again serve as a fortress for these wandering bands of brigands, the authorities at Albi obtained permission to demolish the walls and fortifications surrounding the village. The principal gateway with its machiolations still survives. The castle was rebuilt and stood until the destroying hand of the Revolution levelled it to the ground in 1793. Portions of the hall, a round and a square tower, are all that is left standing. In the sixteenth century the estate ranked second in the district of Albigeois in point of value, being estimated to be worth £1,000,000 of present money. It was surpassed only by the neighbouring property of Castelnau de Bonafous. The owners—there was only one break in the direct line of male descent—appear to have been at all times on good and friendly terms with their vassals, by whom they were faithfully served. The village consuls knew also how to preserve the rights already acquired by the peasantry. One youthful Marquis—this title had been granted to the seigneurs by Louis XIV.—attempted in 1763 to restore the old privilege of compelling the inhabitants to bake their bread at the castle hearth, but speedily gave up his claim at their remonstrance. The same Marquis afterwards dissipated his fortune by gambling, and died overwhelmed by debt in 1785. His son Louis-Marie, known as the Saint of Poitou, was the celebrated royalist general in the war of La Vendée. On the very same day that he fell mortally wounded on the field of battle, his estates at Lescure were wrongfully put up to auction in accordance with the order of the Convention decreeing the sale of the goods of the *émigrés*. His widow was compelled to follow the fortune of the Vendean army, and her sad adventures are graphically described in her memoirs. In 1802 she married Louis de la Rochejaquelein, and eventually succeeded in regaining the greater part of her property as legal heir to her late husband, whose children died in infancy. In 1846 Lescure was parcelled out and sold, but a saving clause prevented the new proprietors from ever assuming the title or name of this ancient fief.

Full details are given of the three churches within the commune.

S. Michael was a priory of the Benedictines of Caillac as early as the eleventh century. It is built of stone in form of a Latin cross, without aisles and with a square tower at the intersection of the transepts. Its fine Romanesque doorway was erected about 1159. S. Peter, originally the chapel of the castle, was built in the fourteenth century, and is of brick and vaulted. It contains the tombs of the seigneurs, and was given by one of them in 1600 for use as a parish church. From this date S. Michael was abandoned and served henceforth as the cemetery chapel. The pilgrimage Church of Nôtre Dame de la Drèche existed in 1185, and became a parish church a few years later. Built on the confines of the territories of Lescure, Albi, and Castelnau, its position led to many attempts by the lords of the latter barony to claim jurisdiction over it. Their claims were put an end to in 1635 by the owner of Lescure allowing them to open a small door in the western wall, so that their retainers might enter the church without having to pass over their neighbours' land.

A plan of the village dated 1652 is given, but a protest must be made against the placing on it of a sketch of the Cathedral of Albi as it stands to-day. This is apt to mislead. The great Church of S. Cecily, till the middle of this century, presented a very different appearance from that of its exterior outline now. It is also a matter of regret that the paper of this edition is of such a flimsy kind. On page 120 the author has erred in stating that the incursion of the Routiers into Languedoc in 1435 was commanded in person by the Prince of Wales. The Black Prince died in 1376. With these exceptions we have nothing but praise for this interesting work. The story is unfolded in a style both lucid and eloquent. Canon Craule passes judgment on the facts which he records in a simple and conscientious manner, and with a sincere desire to arrive at the truth. His statements are proved by sound documentary evidence, and he is to be congratulated on his painstaking search of proofs from original sources, and not for citing second-hand evidence for his history.

R. T.

The Crusades : The Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.

By T. A. ARCHER and C. L. KINGSFORD. Story of the Nations Series. London : T. A. Fisher Unwin. Pp. xxxii-467. Maps and Illustrations.

THIS book appears under the joint names of Mr. Archer and Mr. Kingsford. When ill-health had made it impossible for Mr. Archer to complete what he had undertaken, the work of Mr. Kingsford, who was called in to assist, was found to be necessary in so many places and so important in its nature, that it would have been difficult to divide the responsibility of even a single chapter. There is, however, no want of coherence in consequence. Indeed the result of their joint labours is a volume of such sterling merit as we should have been justified in expecting from authors of such repute. It is well arranged, and clearly, if not brightly or very effectively written. It supplies a large amount of reliable information which has been carefully collected and considered from the original authorities. Though we may not be able to agree with all the opinions expressed by the authors—such for instance as that put forward in the paragraph describing the rise of the Popes to be “the spiritual heads of Christendom,” on p. 24—we are nowhere pained by intemperate language, whilst we are in many instances gratified by the views taken upon certain points which are little accustomed to fair or kindly treatment.

The mere mention of the Crusades carries, to most of us, a whole host of romantic associations. From our youth we have been familiar with the picturesque figure of Peter the Hermit, preaching and exhorting the knights and rough multitudes of soldiers and yeomen to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the Infidel, and answered by the rapturous cries of “*Dieu le veult.*” We have been so fascinated by the brilliant colouring of a work like “The Talisman,” as to forget to think about historical accuracy. Men like Godfrey de Bouillon, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Pope Urban II., Richard I. and Edward I. of England, and St. Louis of France, all rise pleasantly out of the dull recollections of our school histories as heroes that we have loved.

Thus the volume before us may be said to have a twofold claim upon our attention. It appeals to our sentiment, and it satisfies the craving for wider and more certain information. Nor do we know of any work which, in equal compass, treats so reliably and comprehensively the subject of the Crusades. At the same time, as the sub-title, “The Story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem,” clearly indicates only those Crusades which are Crusades in the proper

sense of the word, have been dealt with, because "it is through the history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem that the true character and importance of the Crusades can alone be discerned." (Preface.)

With this limitation, Mr. Archer and Mr. Kingsford's volume covers the entire subject, tracing briefly the rise of pilgrimages to the Holy Places, and showing the necessity of defending the pilgrims from robbery and insult, and so leading naturally on to the series of expeditions undertaken in behalf of the pilgrims and of the Holy Sepulchre. As already pointed out, only those expeditions which were connected with the origin, maintenance, and fall of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, are dealt with in detail: those which frittered themselves away on side-issues, whilst numbered and chronicled as Crusades, receive but a passing notice. It so happens, however, that the Crusades here chosen, on the principle indicated, for fuller treatment, are just the ones which, owing to their connection with English history, are most generally interesting to English readers. On the first, which resulted in the foundation of "the great colony of the Middle Ages"—the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem—went the hapless, easy-going Robert, surnamed Curthose, Duke of Normandy. The third is memorable for the part taken in it by our own Richard I., the lion-hearted Plantagenet, with whose name "Arabian mothers long awed their infants to silence." The eighth presents all the characteristics of a forlorn hope in the utter devotion of its saintly leader, Louis IX. of France, and in the failure of his labours. It is marked out for the eyes of Englishmen by the presence of Edward I. We shall be pardoned for quoting here the paragraph sketching the character of St. Louis:

Louis was perhaps the most truly religious king that ever lived. His whole life was a prayer, his whole aim to do God's will. His horror of sin was deep and unaffected. "Would you rather be a leper, or commit a deadly sin?" he once asked Joinville. The seneschal bluntly blurted out that he would rather commit thirty deadly sins than have his body covered with leprosy. Louis reproved his choice, for the leprosy of the body would disappear at death, but the leprosy of sin lasts hereafter. Everything about the king is charming, from the "As you like it" scene, where he administered justice beneath the great oak at Vincennes, to his washing of the feet of the poor in imitation of Christ. . . . But with all this he was not wealsling or do-nothing. All men trusted him, and the English barons accepted him as arbiter in their disputes with Henry, knowing that he would never seek his own advantage from quarrels among his neighbours. But that which most struck his contemporaries was his extreme sobriety of language; Joinville, who was with him constantly for two and twenty years, declares that he never heard him utter a word of blasphemy, though this was the commonest fault of the age. Pp. 392-4.

In addition to the chapters describing the march of events, there

are others devoted to accounts of the land and its people, the life of the people, arms, armour, and armaments. Due prominence is also accorded to the two great military orders, the Templars and the Hospitallers.

The concluding chapter is given up to an interesting estimate of the results of the Crusades. To their influence the authors attribute the growth of the Italian seaports, and of the power of the Popes as the heads of a united Christendom. The Crusades acted as combining and disintegrating forces, tending on the one hand to centralise power in the hands of royal officials, and on the other, to raise the status of the lower orders by relieving them of the oppression of their feudal lords. By these united expeditions political intercourse between nations was begun and fostered. Once more the West learnt lessons from the ancient East, the standard of comfort was raised, geography, astronomy, and other sciences were benefited, whilst a new and romantic literature sprang up, taking for its theme the deeds of great warriors, and deriving much of its colouring from the stately richness and glow of Eastern fable.

The Crusades were essentially holy wars. As the authors point out "the war was God's warfare, to be waged in His behalf for the recovery of the heritage of Christ, the land which Our Blessed Lord Himself had trod," pp. 446-7. Other motives doubtless entered in to mar the glory of this high ideal, but there can be no doubt that the great mass of the Crusaders came at some time or other under its spell. If such was the inspiration of the Crusades, their main objects were no less praiseworthy. The first practical end in view was, of course, the restoration of the Holy Places to Christian rule; another and a secondary object, clear only perhaps to such men as Urban II., was the defence of Eastern Europe against the danger of Turkish conquests. The first object was achieved quickly, and then gradually failed. The second, a point of more general and lasting importance to the world at large, was certainly the great achievement of the Crusades. In this we are pleased to note the agreement of our authors with the opinions expressed by such writers as Cardinal Newman and Mr. Sharon Turner.

It was an imperative necessity for the welfare of Christendom that the advance of the Turks—which during the eleventh century had made such rapid progress—should be stayed. The first Crusade rolled back the tide of conquest from the walls of Constantinople, and the wars of the next two centuries gave full employment to the superfluous energies of Islam. . . . The importance of this for Western civilisation cannot be over-estimated. Had the capture of Constantinople by Mohammed II. been anticipated by three centuries, it is impossible that the Turkish conquests should have been confined to the peninsula of the Balkans and the valley

of the Lower Danube. A new influx of barbarism, at the very moment when the gloom of the Dark Ages was breaking, might have been as ruinous to the social and political life of Western Europe, as it was to that of Western Asia. Pp. 449, 450.

The value of the work is still further enhanced by a copious index, genealogical tables, maps, and fifty-eight illustrations, fully explained in a descriptive list. That these illustrations are appropriate in their nature we are only too ready to admit; but we are again bound to record our dissatisfaction that the general *quality* of the reproductions is so poor, and so far short of the merits of the series of works in which they appear.

J. B. M.

Sir William Gregory, K.C.M.G., formerly Member of Parliament, and sometime Governor of Ceylon. An Autobiography. Edited by Lady GREGORY. London: Murray. 1894. Pp. viii-407.

THESE memoirs were written by Sir William Gregory for the benefit of his wife and son, and apparently were not intended by him for publication; but his widow has given them to the world in the hope that thereby his name "may be kept alive a little longer, and that for his sake a friendly hand may sometimes in the future be held out to his boy." Sir William was born in 1817, and was educated at Harrow and Oxford, where he acquired a taste for the classics which never left him; a taste which was fostered by the kindly and friendly influence of Lord Wellesley, several of whose letters are published in this volume. In 1842 he took his seat in the House of Commons as member for Dublin, but only retained it for five years. He was not again elected till 1857, from which year till 1872 he was the representative of Galway. He resigned his seat on being appointed Governor of Ceylon, a post which had been the object of his ambition for many years. He proved himself to be a thoroughly able administrator and did much to improve the condition of the colony, and to promote the welfare of the natives; of whom in many ways he had a high opinion. They on their part appreciated his efforts; and his memory lived among them after he had resigned his office. He had a proof of this when he revisited the island some years later, for a native woman, a nurse in the household of a gentleman he knew, went over a hundred miles to see him, saying to her employer, "He is our god: he is the god of my people." It is a pity that with this mutual good feeling he should only have retained the Governorship for five years. And whatever may be thought of some

portions of these memoirs, the part relating to Ceylon is certainly of more than family interest.

L'Ame d'un Missionnaire. Vie du Père Nempon, Missionnaire Apostolique du Tonkin Occidental. Par l'Abbé GUSTAVE MONTENNIS, Professeur de Philosophie à l'Institution de Notre Dame-des-Dunes. Paris: Victor Retaux et fils, Libraires-Editeurs, 82 Rue Bonaparte. 1895.

THE letter of Cardinal Rampolla granting to the author the special blessing of the Holy Father, the many approbations from Archbishops, Bishops, and other persons in high ecclesiastical rank and the distinction which the book received from the Académie Française more than sufficiently prove that the Abbé Montennis has given us a work of extraordinary merit and of the greatest value.

The volume, containing about 400 pages, narrates in a most entertaining manner, the life of Père Nempon, missionary in Tonkin. The first half of the book describes Fr. Nempon's early life at home, his years of study and preparation at the Petit Séminaire et Hazenbrouck, the Grand Séminaire de Cambrai, and at the Séminaire des Mission Etrangères in Paris; the solemnity of his ordination, and his departure for Tonkin. The second half of the book deals with Fr. Nempon's missionary life in Tonkin. It contains a great amount of very interesting information about the country, its people, its religion and government, its political relation to France. Professor Montennis has wonderfully succeeded in giving life and action to this part of his history. A very vivid description is given of the missionary's labour, journeys, success and disappointments, of his moments of joy and suffering, and his illness and early death are written in a most touching manner.

Fr. Nempon's life was short. Ordained priest 28th February 1885, he died the 13th December 1889. Yet his life was that of a true saint and martyr. In all his sayings and actions we find that that simplicity of mind, that gentleness and nobility of character, that love for God, and the desire to work and offer himself for the good of his fellow-creatures, which mark the saints of God. His motto was: "Dieu et les âmes"; his one wish: "Vivre au Tonkin et y mourir."

Primogeniture: A short history of its development in various countries and its practical effects. By EVELYN CECIL, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, and a member of the London School Board. London: John Murray. 1895.

THIS is a well-timed and well-written essay upon a subject of immediate interest. The abolition of the law of Primogeniture by which, on intestacy, real property passes exclusively to the eldest son, or his heir-at-law, is being pressed forward by a certain school of political reformers, or at all events, innovators, who desire that, when there is no will or settlement, realty should go the way of personalty, that is, be divided among the next of kin, according to the Statute of Distributions. This change is opposed by a Conservative school of legislation, not, however, necessarily co-extensive with the Conservative party, who contend that the excessive *morcellement* of land which would arise under this arrangement would be highly objectionable both from an agricultural and a social point of view. The danger, as Mr. Cecil points out, is probably more imaginary than real, as long as the power of devising and settling land is left intact. But if the existing presumption of the law in favour of Primogeniture is to be altered, Mr. Cecil prefers a middle course between absolute abolition and absolute retention. He would adopt, in its essential features, the system of the *Auerbeurecht*, at present in operation in many States of the German Empire, by which, on intestacy, an estate devolves undivided to one child or heir, with fair shares to the others. Thus, suppose an inheritance worth £20,000 to be divided among three children. Then, for the purpose of calculating the children's shares, the inheritance will be assumed to be perhaps worth only £15,000, instead of £20,000; so that the calculation makes each child's share worth £5000 ($£15,000 \div 3$) only. Accordingly two of the children will receive shares of £5000 each, and the *Auerbe* will not only receive this £5000 share, but also the difference between the actual and assumed values of the inheritance (£20,000—£15,000), or, in this instance, £5000 more. A compromise on some such lines, Mr. Cecil believes, would combine the advantages while avoiding the evils of both extremes. It would do what the intestate would probably have desired to see done. It would prevent the excessive division of land, with its alleged mischiefs. It would protect testators from such an *in terrorem* action of public opinion as exists in America, where, owing to the presumption of law in favour of equal division on intestacy, nobody dares devise his estate to his eldest son. In support of this thesis

Mr. Cecil, in the course of 200 and odd quarto pages, gives a succinct and lucid account of the history and present position of the contrasted principles of Primogeniture and equal division in the United Kingdom, Europe, America, the British Colonies, Asiatic Turkey, and India. Apart from its controversial purpose, Mr. Cecil's treatise is in itself valuable and interesting in the highest degree to lawyer and layman alike. His reading has been extensive, accurate, and up to date—he refers to fully 150 books, not skimmed, but evidently examined with care—and he has reproduced his material in an arrangement and style that are attractive and easy to follow, with an occasional tendency to picturesque writing even, which is not substantially marred by one or two rather oddly mixed metaphors. Altogether this is an uncommonly good book of its kind.

Napoléon III. avant L'Empire. Par H. THIRRIA. Tome Premier.
Deuxième Édition. Paris: Librairie Plon. 1895.

THIS large book of 477 pages consists to a great extent of extracts from old newspapers; and when we consider the curiosities and varieties of public opinion on the different stages in the very remarkable career of its subject, we cannot deny that newspaper-cuttings well selected, as are these for the most part, form an admirable material of illustration. Nevertheless, "Opinions of the Press," as they are technically termed, whether they be on matters personal, or on matters political, or puffs of books, soaps, or patent medicines, provide a literary food of which it is quite possible to grow weary. But it must not be supposed that the author has concocted his book solely by means of the paste-pot and the scissors. On the contrary, he has enriched it with a great number of exceedingly interesting and valuable letters, and he has added a further attraction to it in quotations from the writings of poets and authors who have occasionally made contemporary French politics their themes. Excellent footnotes give the authorities for most of his statements, and they frequently contain carefully-chosen extracts from books bearing on his subject. Nor is the work at all wanting in valuable original writing; and, best of all, while the author is a great admirer of Napoleon III., he is by no means blind to the deficiencies in his character. Indeed he freely admits that, with all his talents and virtues, he was not made to be the ruler of a great country, and that his reign proved a misfortune to France.

One of the first things which strikes the reader of this history of

Napoleon III. is the devotion and attention with which his mother superintended his education. Every Saturday she gave up the entire day to going over his work of the past week with him. Charles Louis Napoléon Bonaparte was a precocious boy; he talked little, and, perhaps, the lad's chief defect may have been his indecision. When he was on the threshold of manhood, Chateaubriand said that he was a studious, well-informed young man, virtuous, and naturally reserved. The author passes over very lightly the part he took, as a youth, in the revolution in Italy, when the cause which he then espoused was suppressed by the papal troops; but there may have been no need to dwell upon his early follies. After this adventure, and his escape from Italy in disguise, he and his mother lived for some time in Switzerland. At the age of twenty-four he became heir to the Imperial dignities, and meanwhile, without any special instigation on his part, Bonapartism came more and more into fashion in France, under the influence of politicians, poets, and playwrights. At the request of Casimir Perier, the statue of Napoleon I. was replaced on the famous column in the Place Vendôme, and, more important still, the body of that Emperor was brought to France and deposited with extraordinary pomp and great popular demonstrations in the magnificent mausoleum prepared for it at the Hôtel des Invalides.

At about the age of twenty-eight, Louis Napoleon over-estimated, or rather, perhaps, anticipated, the development of *le culte Bonapartiste*, and he imagined that he had only to present himself at some large garrison to be surrounded by all the troops crying "Vive l'Empéreur!" He selected Strasbourg for this purpose, and promptly learned that he had been much mistaken, the result being a miserable and most humiliating failure. The *Times* called it an insurrection as ridiculous as it was imprudent, and the *Standard* said that the only effect of this absurd attempt had been to strengthen the government of Louise Philippe. The French authorities shipped off the would-be emperor to America, and it was said that he gave his word of honour never again to set his foot in Europe; but this the author most emphatically denies. He had not been in America more than six or seven months when his mother wrote to inform him that she was about to undergo a very dangerous operation; so he returned to her side in Switzerland, and she died not very long afterwards. In 1838, the French Government demanded his expulsion from that country; and, in order to avoid involving it in a war, he went voluntarily to London. We are told much that is interesting about his studies, literary work, and political aspirations, during his residence in this country;

but we English readers could wish to have heard more about his social life in London, the part which he took in the Eglinton tournament, his becoming a special constable during the Chartist riots, and many other matters connected with both his first and his second long residence in England; things which are scarcely mentioned, or even left entirely unnoticed, in these pages.

When he was thirty-two, he made another attempt to summon the French army to the support of "the nephew of my uncle," as he was fond of calling himself until laughed out of it by the comic papers; and, for this purpose, he hired an English steamboat and went to Boulogne with about fifty followers, but the soldiers there would have nothing to say to him; he was arrested, tried for treason, and condemned to perpetual imprisonment in the fortress of Ham. Again the English newspapers derided him; the *Morning Post* said that he was a maniac, and the *Sun* called him a fool. After spending some half-dozen years in his prison, whiling away the time with study, the cultivation of flowers, riding in the courtyard, receiving visitors, and writing innumerable letters, he managed, with the help of his doctor and his valet, to escape in the disguise of a workman and to return to London. The few pages describing his flight and the ingenuity with which Dr. Conneau deceived the governor of the fortress by putting a lay-figure into his bed and pretending that he was ill, are very entertaining.

During his second residence in London he wrote his "Rêveries Politiques," and elaborated a plan for joining the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by a canal—not through Panama, but through Nicaragua. When the French Revolution broke out in 1848 he was quite unprepared to profit by it; but by-and-by he was allowed to return to France, and soon afterwards he was nominated as a candidate for the National Assembly. The excitement was intense. The French newspapers discussed his candidature, always with eagerness, often with animosity, still oftener with ridicule. No gross caricature, with pen or pencil, no sarcasm, no ill-natured aspersion on his character was withheld. Nor were the English newspapers much less severe upon him. The *Morning Herald* said that in all the many and curious positions in life which this Adonis of forty years old had occupied, whether as an officer, a writer, a Swiss subject, or when presenting himself at Boulogne as emperor, with his tame eagle, his *cortège* of mistresses, and his legion of cooks, he was always and equally ridiculous. After various electoral adventures—getting elected, resigning, and afterwards being elected for five departments at once, he became one of six candidates for a much more exalted post, namely, the Presidency of the French

Republic. And now came success! He obtained about twice as many votes as all his five rivals made between them, "Ce n'est pas une élection, dit M. de Girardin, c'est une acclamation." It was much more than that. As the author says in a closing paragraph, the people, without admitting, or even being aware of it, had elected, not a President of the Republic, but an Emperor.

The Deserts of Southern France. By S. BARING GOULD, M.A.
2 vols. London: Methuen & Co. 1894.

THIS is an interesting book. It is difficult to say to what class it belongs, for it is neither a guide-book, nor a history of a province, nor a book of travels, nor the advertisement of a new health-resort, but something of each; and, generally speaking, it contains what would be the most readable and desirable chapters of each. Perhaps it would be best described as a collection of carefully considered and carefully written and sufficiently well illustrated magazine articles on the topics of interest connected with a little-known but romantic district in southern France. It is such a book as we should be delighted to find in the reading-room of an hotel in the district—the very thing in which to look up interesting facts about what we have seen during the day or to prepare for the next excursion; but none the less it will be found pleasant enough reading by untravelled folks, and, in the present dearth of English literature on the subject, a useful addition to the library.

Mr. Baring Gould is an admirable guide; he is never in want of reasons to explain facts, and is always able to make himself clear to his readers. He begins with a lucid statement of geological statistics, and afterwards he introduces the reader to the latest theories about caves and cave-dwellings, pre-historic deposits, the first inhabitants of Southern Gaul, glass-castles, the natural history of truffles, dolmen-builders, bastides and the architecture of the domed churches peculiar to that part of France. He is a man who always has a most definite opinion, seldom admits of doubt, and one finds little difficulty in understanding either his descriptions or deductions. As we have said, he is an excellent guide, authoritative, confident and unhesitating, ready to pilot his reader along underground streams or to explain to him the manufacture of Roquefort cheese, equally willing and able to instruct as to the character and acquirements of the reindeer-hunter of the palæolithic period, the *routier* of the Middle Ages or the peasant of modern France. It is all very

fascinating; and, whether acquainted with the subject or not, the careful reader will agree in most matters with the author, for Mr. Baring Gould has evidently been at great pains to master his subject, to choose the most plausible explanation and to make it easily intelligible.

Perhaps the book would have been more convincing if the author, before giving his solutions, had pointed out the difficulties to be solved and said something of the theories that failed to solve them. He himself is one who has seen, and therefore believes, either one way or another. It is only natural he should have made up his mind. Readers who have to take things altogether on faith will always do so more readily when their faith is asked in the form of a choice between a satisfactory theory or a bad one.

As a suggestion concerning a possible use of certain caves and series of caves in the days immediately before the Hundred Years War, may they not have been, in some cases, Charter-Houses, the hermit-dwellings of Carthusian monks? This would suggest a use for the basins cut in slabs of stone at the entrance of some of the caves, the meaning of which is obscure. The rations of each monk were supplied from the common kitchen, and, where there could be no hatch at which the monk could call every morning, there is little doubt a lay-brother would daily deposit the allowance in some receptacle at the entrance to the cell.

Mr. Baring Gould devotes the best part of a volume to the history of the region. Slight as is his sketch, it reads like the chapters of a romance—not because the author draws upon his imagination, but because of the picturesque events of the history. Is it not strange that no one in this country has devoted himself to an exact, full, and interesting study of the English occupation of Aquitaine? Surely it deserves more attention than a few pages in our larger histories or a few paragraphs in our text-books. Mr. Baring Gould's book shows us that there are documents enough in existence to make the work possible, though it would take much time and skill and labour to piece the bright-coloured fragments together and construct a true and intelligible picture of such troubled times. The outline in the present volume is admirable as far as it goes, and for the most part sufficiently true, though the author is always a partisan and has the true novelist's like or dislike of his characters. Not that he is unable to see the good points of an adversary—he can do so very well when he tries to do it—but that when interested in Henry II. he calls St. Thomas-a-Becket “an insolent and an ostentatiously ascetic prelate,” whilst, if interested in the saint, he would doubtless find equally hard words for the king.

A romantic episode of the history is the crusade of the "Capuati," or the brotherhood of peacemakers, against the free-companies. Our sympathies are enlisted strongly in the manly enterprise of the peasants, and we feel regret at their rapid and complete failure after striking initial success. Is there much known of the effort in 1229 to establish a similar military order for the same object and almost with the same name? The brothers and chevaliers "de la Paix et de la Foi" were organised by a few bishops with Améreus, Archbishop of Auch, at their head, and in 1230 received the confirmation of Pope Gregory IX. The Prologue of their rule* waxes eloquent at the waste of a fertile country and the afflictions of poor Aquitaine, where innocent people "vulnerantur, lapidantur, jugulantur, spoliata fluminibus submerguntur" by parricides, assassins, and thievish villains, and the writer complains sadly that there is no king or priest to cry out "Qui Domini est accingetur meum." The rules are simple and well adapted to a mixed congregation of peasants, artisans, squires and petty nobles. The habit is white, of any honest stuff, "de panno scilicet qui dicitur Estamfort albus, vel de alio blanqueto, vel camelino, sive burello," &c., there is a good deal of fasting; prayers of the simplest form—a certain number of Pater-nosters for each of the recognised hours; strict obedience and a certain amount of silence. Married people are admitted, but those who enter unmarried are not allowed to marry afterwards. It is probably this rule, and another which forbade the holding of any property except in common, that unfitted the congregation for very wide acceptance. It had only a short existence, for we find it dissolved in 1261. We heartily recommend Mr. Baring Gould's book to our readers.

Mémoires du Chevalier De Mautort, Capitaine au Régiment d'Austrasie, Chevalier de l'Ordre Royal et Militaire de Saint-Louis (1752-1802). Publiés par son PETIT-NEVEU LE BON TILLETTE DE CLERMONT-TONNERRE. Avec un portrait en héliogravure. Paris: Librairie Plon. 1895.

THE high-roads of history, in the form of standard works devoted to that great subject, are well known and well trodden; its lanes and bypaths are less familiar and less explored, but it is by following these that the historian is often led to the discovery of

* *Vide* "Voyage Littéraire de deux Religieux Bénédictins," 1717, per seconde partie, p. 23.

hitherto unsuspected riches, or at least to the finding of missing gems in the jewels of the historical treasury. The student, again, of peoples or periods ought not to limit his reading to the annals of kings and queens, statesmen and generals, but should endeavour to form some idea of the life of more ordinary mortals from the pages of much humbler memoirs. "*Les Memoires du Chevalier De Mautort*" is the kind of book which is likely to interest both the writers and the readers of the history of the second half of the eighteenth century in France. It consists of the autobiography and recollections of an officer, of no special celebrity, in an infantry regiment, during the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI.

When De Mautort's father died he left each of his sons about £600; and, after paying duties, they found themselves possessed of an income of between £20 and £25 apiece. Louis François was sent to a school kept by one of the chaplains of the cathedral at Amiens. He calls it an "infernal place," and tells us that the priest-schoolmaster was guilty of "unequalled brutality," dealing blows with his ferule with little discrimination. Afterwards he went to a large college at Juilly, kept by the Fathers of the Oratory; and he gives this establishment the highest praise. Of course the boys were always under "la surveillance" of a prefect, who never left them either at their studies or their recreations; and this shows that the practice in question is not specially of Jesuit origin, as some erroneously suppose. At fifteen, he went to a tutor to study mathematics with a view to passing for the Artillery; but he had no aptitude for that science; so he gave it up and tried to get into the Line. Just at that time, owing to some alterations which had been made in the military service, there were scarcely any vacancies for subalterns, so the colonels, to oblige their friends, were admitting relations of officers as volunteers into their regiments, with the understanding that they were to receive commissions as vacancies occurred; and De Mautort, at the age of sixteen, joined a regiment under these conditions, at Perpignan, near the Spanish frontier. As wine there cost only a sou a bottle, there was a good deal of drunkenness, and another disagreeable experience of the young volunteer was a very cold welcome.

His description of life at Perpignan in those days is most interesting; but when he goes on to say that the religion of the people was still burdened with superstitions, which had been contracted while that part of France had been under Spanish rule, he loses our sympathy, especially when he gives as an example of these superstitions the custom of a monk, nude to the waist, walking in a procession on Good Friday, while four other monks gave him strokes with disciplines. Whatever objection may be made to this penitential exercise, we fail to see how

it can justly be called "superstitious." Before long, his regiment was sent to Corsica, where he was under fire for the first time. In the course of the campaign there, some soldiers pillaged a Franciscan convent, bayonetted three friars, and burned the church. Here, again, the priests and the monks had great power over the "superstitious" people; and it is hinted that they often abused it. From Corsica the regiment went to Metz, and the portion of the book describing that fortress and the life there is interesting, particularly when we consider its subsequent history during the Franco-German war of only a quarter of a century ago. Brest was the next fortress occupied by the regiment; and the account of the prison there, and the treatment of the prisoners, is of special value. During the stay of some Spaniards at Brest, the author had an opportunity of hearing of, and to some extent observing also, the differences between their customs and those of the French. When their priests entered a café, the Spanish officers rose from their seats, overwhelmed them with civility, and kissed their hands or their cassocks. The French "laughed at all this without having any desire to imitate it." The Spaniards, on the other hand, regarded the French officers, "although professing like themselves the Catholic religion, as infinitely more dangerous than those of a different faith." So, at least, says the author.

From Brest, De Mautort's regiment embarked for India. On the voyage thither they had the "ill-luck" to encounter Admiral Rodney. Several of the French ships were taken, and the one in which De Mautort was sailing barely escaped. Another curious incident of this voyage was the superstitious—here we admit the superstition—practice of whipping a cabin-boy, in a dead calm, as a sacrifice to Æolus, in order to raise the wind. As the whole crew solemnly defiled past the poor little innocent victim, who was bound to a capstan and prepared for punishment in Etonian fashion, every one gave him some strokes with a cat o' nine tails. There is a spirited account of the battle of Santiago, and various other adventures enlivened the way to India. As to his time in India itself, it was from end to end one of excitement and incident. It comprised no less than six campaigns, and its description occupies about a hundred and twenty pages. Nor are personal details wanting. Of these, that De Mautort was severely wounded in action may be given as a passive instance, and that he bought a slave, as an active. At last came peace, and he sold his tent, his horse, and some of his other goods to his new friends and *quondam* enemies, the English officers.

* In 1785 he was back again in Paris. In 1789 symptoms of the

coming Revolution began to manifest themselves, and we read much about "les Sans-Culottes," "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité," and the "souveraineté du Peuple." In 1790, De Mautort received the decoration of the cross of Saint-Louis, which he naïvely tells us he had been asking for in vain since 1783. Although pleased with it at first, his gratification ceased the following year when he observed that it was given to nearly everybody who chose to beg for it. The pages telling the story of the Revolution are of the greatest interest. De Mautort retired from the French army just before it began. Shortly after the Revolution broke out he crossed the frontier in order to be away from France in her distracted condition; and he then entered the army of Picardy. This he soon left, and the rest of the book, with the exception of the two last chapters, describes his various adventures during ten miserable years as an *émigré*. The last few pages tell us about his return to France. The writer's tone may not always be exactly to our taste; the narrative may here and there be a trifle tedious; the style may occasionally be rather commonplace; but the book contains much that is interesting, a great deal of it casts a valuable side-light on the history of its period, and the general reader who glances through it will find a fair sprinkling of entertaining passages.

**Les Bénédictins de Saint-Germain-des-Près et les Savants
Lyonnais d'après leur correspondance inédite.** Par M.
L'ABBÉ JEAN BAPTISTE VANEL. Paris: A. Picard. Lyon: E.
Vitte. 1894.

THE learned and enthusiastic Vicaire of St. Germain-des-Près who has given to the light this new volume of the Letters of the Maurist Benedictines has not, perhaps, produced a book quite so interesting as those which have appeared in recent years from the pen of M. Valéry, M. Alphonse Dantier, M. Jadard, or M. E. de Broglie. But there is quite enough matter and novelty in it to deserve a welcome from all who venerate the names of Mabillon, Ruinart, D'Achery, and their *confrères*. The editor, in his researches among the enormous collections of Benedictine papers which exist in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, has confined himself chiefly to such letters of the monks of St. Germain as have reference to Lyons. The first letter of the series is one of Dom Mabillon, hitherto unpublished, addressed to Mgr. de Saint-Georges, Archbishop of Lyons (March 27, 1707), on the subject of the succes-

sion of the bishops of that See in the eleventh century. The second chapter gives a very interesting letter of Père Théophile Raynaud, the celebrated Jesuit, who passed the greater part of his life in the Jesuit College at Lyons. This letter is, however, dated from Rome, 1650, when P. Raynaud professed in the Gregorian University—and its subject is the edition of “St. Anselm,” brought out by Dom D'Achery in 1648. He hopes that the Benedictine superiors will put all possible pressure on that father to go on producing similar works. There are several other letters of this militant Jesuit, in which, among other things, we find allusions to his book against De Launoy on the Scapular of Mount Carmel, and his attack on Father Papebrock, his own *confrère*. Further on (p. 79) Mgr. de Montmorin, Archbishop of Vienne, a Cistercian monk, writes several letters to Mabillon and Ruinart, consulting them on points of history and charging them with the purchase of books in Paris. There is, in one of them, an allusion to the holy death of King James II. It is well known that the Duke of Perth became connected by ties of intimate friendship with Mabillon and Saint-Germain-des-Près, and we can, therefore, easily understand to what the Archbishop is replying when he thus writes to Dom Ruinart (September 27, 1702):—

I have not the slightest doubt that God is glorifying by miracles the late King of England; he has merited this by the resignation with which he has borne all the crosses sent by God to purify so great a soul. If his life is well written, as I do not doubt it will be, it will greatly edify the Church (p. 79).

There is an excellent bibliographical chapter on the Anisson family—the Lyons booksellers who brought out Dom Montfaucon's magnificent edition of “St. Athanasius,” and who were appointed by the influence of Saint Germain to the post of printers to the king in Paris; a post which they held till the last of them perished on the scaffold at the Revolution. One of the most striking figures in the book is that of Dom Claude Estionnet, whom Mabillon calls “Stephanotius noster.” Dom Estionnet has a distinction which is perhaps unique even among the Maurists. He left fifty MS. volumes all ready for the press, and has not printed a single one. His researches, his literary journeys, his troubles with a commendatory abbot, and his excellent relations with his own superiors are brought out by many letters, and numerous notes by the editor. Dom Thuillier, the staunch advocate of the Constitution *Unigenitus*, has many new pages devoted to him, in which fresh contributions are made to the understanding of the various phases of the Jansenist controversy. There is only one allusion, as far as we can find,

to Fénelon ; it is in a letter of Dom Fillastre, who writes with much spirit and some wrong-headedness, to Dom Massuet, the producer of the great edition of "St. Irenæus ;" but all that he has to say is that "Mgr. de Cambrai wrote him [a certain Bishop of Bayeux] a letter *toute spirituelle*, that hides a delicate censure under what looks like hearty praise" (p. 313).

Un Diplomate à Londres. CHARLES GAVARD. Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1895.

THIS volume consists of a collection of letters and notes written by a former First Secretary to the French Embassy in London, who took up his residence in Albert Gate immediately after the fall of the second Empire, and remained there until the end of 1877. These collected letters were addressed during that period to friends and relatives in France, and, as is natural, are filled with many interesting impressions of our institutions and public men. M. Gavard appears to have been a close observer, to have met all the important individuals of the day, examined all the intricacies of our social structure, and judged very justly our merits and defects. Consequently this volume is of considerable interest to English readers, and will have, it may perhaps be affirmed, even some historical value. Of course his opinions are given in his purely private capacity ; but for that very reason they are all the more trustworthy. He frequently met Cardinal Manning, and like every one else was an intense admirer. He had repeated conversations with Disraeli, Gladstone, Lord Granville, and Lord Salisbury. He was a constant visitor of the exiled royal family of France, and details some strange meetings with the mysterious Robert le Fort. He was on intimate terms with Sir Charles Dilke, Dean Stanley, Burton, Leighton, and innumerable others. As might be expected, he tells us many things about his chiefs, the Duc de Broglie and the Comte d'Harcourt. Besides his diplomatic and political engagements, he had many of a purely social character. He spent pleasant days at Woburn, at Hatfield, at Twickenham, and at Walmer Castle. He visited Oxford, penetrated into the lodging-houses of White-chapel, and did not omit to see a boat race. His remarks on all these people and topics are sometimes keen and just, sometimes amusing, nearly always bright and entertaining. It is thus he describes the appearance of Cardinal Manning when he first saw him : "Belle-tête, grand air, figure ascétique et de race ; il m' a ravi."

He cannot resist referring to the Lord Mayor and his wife as "le roi et la reine de pique on de cœur," by reason of their peculiar "costumes de cérémonie." Here is an exquisitely brief estimate of Lord Salisbury: "Il y a deux hommes dans Salisbury, l'homme simple, charmant, que tout le monde connaît quand on cause avec lui en tête-à-tête, et l'orateur amer, violent, qu'on entend dans toutes les assemblées où il prend parole." There are many more luminous passages in these notes and letters, and, as it is impossible to quote them, we must content ourselves with confidently recommending our readers to find them out and enjoy them.

There are several blunders in the English introduced into many of M. Gavard's letters. In some cases this may be laid at the door of the editor of the volume, in others M. Gavard himself is clearly to blame. We may site as examples such expressions as: "the pass wine," "at the dark," "a people day" at the "Cristal Palace," "l' evening toast" (for "the toast of the evening"); such spellings as "theater," "sherif," "essay'ists," "lesaies" (for "the ayes"), and "les nos" (for "the noes"). These are trifling mistakes, no doubt, for a Frenchman, but they ought not to find their way into future reprints.

R. L. K.

De Genève À Rome : Impressions et Souvenirs. THÉODORE DE LA RIVE. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1895.

THROUGH some three hundred pages M. de la Rive traces his rather arduous but steady journey from Geneva to Rome. He did well to present his impressions to the public; because his impressions are by no means trite or unworthy of being put into print. They are original, well reasoned, and earnest. That one who was to so marked a degree a Calvinist, whose surroundings and hereditary tendencies were wholly Calvinistic, should have turned round and ardently embraced Catholicism is a matter for no little surprise. But turn round he assuredly did—not rashly, fanatically, but slowly, surely, and in logical sequence. His conversion was deeply thought out, and therefore the more valuable. In an admirable appendix he names the principal works that contributed to bring about the change in his theological tenets. He read Bossuet, Fénelon, and other great religious authors of the sixteenth century. Being quite in touch with the thought of his own time he could not escape being affected by the Oxford Movement. Newman and Manning were naturally to him bright lights on the way. At length he discovered

the falsity of the religion of Geneva, saw its "powerlessness to satisfy the most natural, most legitimate aspirations of the human heart," and recognised the truth, the eternal consistency of the Catholic Church. His account of the workings of his mind throughout the period of his conversion, as expressed in this impressive volume, cannot be sufficiently commended for its clearness as regards literary style, and its earnestness as regards religious conviction. For hesitating non-Catholics it cannot fail to resolve many doubts, and recent converts or weak believers are bound to find that a thoughtful perusal of this excellent treatise will give them much courage and strength.

Slav and Moslem. Historical sketches by J. MILLIKEN NAPIER
BRODHEAD. Aiken Publishing Co., Aiken S.C. 1894.

MR. BRODHEAD is an ardent Russophile. In him the Slav has found an enthusiastic advocate. He has travelled a good deal in Russia, he has consulted the most diverse and the most obscure authorities on his subject, and, as far as can be seen, he appears to know his ground thoroughly. His knowledge is nothing if not broad. All the lights of the present century, from Carlyle to Mr. Stead, are brought to bear upon his theme. His pages bristle with quotations, with the result that his work is rather a clever piece of encyclopædic journalism—very American journalism too—than a respectable series of historical sketches. Russia has had a disappointing past, and has developed only to fall back again; but she has a great future, thinks Mr. Brodhead, and an important part to play in the politics of the world. He is right when he states that her tardy development is to be ascribed to her embracing the Eastern Schism rather than Latin Christianity, a course which always kept her outside the pale of European civilisation. She again lost her chance of becoming a cultured member of international society when the Council of Florence proved abortive. But it is as the opponent of the Turk that she is to be seen in her worthiest rôle. Herein lie her prospects. There is certainly much truth in this opinion. At the present moment, for example, she ought to be the true protector of the Armenians, a people with whom she may be supposed to have some sympathy. England has nothing in common with these Eastern Christians, and yet, for political reasons, advertisement, and the sake of seeming heroic, she champions their cause. This book is filled with interesting points, nearly all of which are old

and drawn from sources other than the brain of the author. But, as Mr. Brodhead would say, that is, a detail. It is as an entertaining *résumé* of other people's opinions, an admirable compilation.

R. L. K.

Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine.

Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi, ad codicum man-
scriptorum fidem recensuit JOHANNES WORDSWORTH, S.T.P.,
Episcopus Sarisfuriensis. Partis prioris fasciculus quartus.
Evangelium sec. Johannem. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1895.

THE three first numbers—including the Synoptist Gospels—of this most important work have been already separately noticed in the DUBLIN REVIEW. It must not be supposed therefore, because only a very few words are said here about the fourth number, that the work is undervalued or regarded as deteriorating from its former excellence. It may be truly said that no more important service has been rendered to students of the Vulgate text since the time of Clement VIII. Nor is there any reason for Catholics to look with suspicion upon the labours of the present editors. No one supposes that the edition of the Vulgate published by Clement VIII., and now in use in the Church, is entirely perfect. Far from it. No doubt there would be many inconveniences attending the introduction of a new edition of the Vulgate into the Liturgy and Theology of the Church. And it may be said that for practical purposes, the present edition is sufficiently perfect. However that may be, it cannot but be of importance for students of the Bible to have as accurate an edition of the Vulgate as it is possible to construct. Towards such an edition the new Wordsworth recension will be of great service. It is constructed on the same lines as before. The various available codices are collated, and the different readings duly registered in the notes. It is evidently a work of great labour and care, and deserves the thanks of all who are interested in the study of the Vulgate.

J. A. H.

Une Ancienne Version Latine de l'Ecclésiastique. Fragment publié pour la première fois, accompagné du fac-similé du Manuscrit Visigoth. Par C. DOUAI. Paris: Alphonse Picard. 1895.

THIS fragment, containing chap. xxi. 20-31, and chap. xxii. 1-27 of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, was discovered at Toulouse by M. Judicis in the year 1846. The writing of the MS. is undoubtedly Visigoth, and M. Douai has no hesitation in assigning to it a Spanish origin; in fact in deciding that it comes from the kingdom of Toledo, and that it belongs to the eighth or ninth century.

M. Douai, having compared the fragment of Toulouse, with the well-known Bible of Metz and Bible of Theodulf, decides that they are not connected with one another. But as a result of his investigations, he concludes that we ought to admit the existence of at least two translations of Ecclesiasticus; of one of which the Vulgate is the type, the MS. of Toulouse of the other. The version, of which the Toulouse MS. is a fragment, is, M. Douai conjectures, based upon the current African Latin version, freely emended from the Greek; so that the result became in reality a new translation. When this translation was made M. Douai does not venture to say, though he suggests the end of the fourth century; and even mentions the name of St. Jerome in connection with it. The Toulouse MS. would be a copy of this version, made after a considerable lapse of time and containing many corruptions.

J. A. H.

Six Months in a Syrian Monastery. By OSWALD H. PARRY. London: Horace Cox. 1895.

IF money could purchase the conversion of nations, there is little doubt that the British missionary associations would long since have spread the doctrines of Christianity throughout the world. For who can tell the tens of millions that have been contributed for that purpose by Protestants both in England and America? It was not, however, by an outlay of money that the chosen Twelve brought the peoples of Europe and Asia to the light of faith. Neither did the Apostles of later ages rely upon the power of the purse to promote their missionary labours.

Mr. Parry, in the volume before us, gives a more or less interesting account of a journey of his, undertaken on behalf of the Syrian Patriarchate Education Society in 1892. His visit was to the old

Syrian Church, a body numbering some 150,000 or 200,000 souls, and plunged in the darkness of ignorance and error. Mr. Parry regards them from the good old Protestant standpoint; and, untaught by past failure, apparently imagines that it is the lot of Anglicanism to convert them to genuine Christianity. It is almost amusing to find Mr. Parry referring to a reverence for the Bible, as still a kind of specialty of Protestantism. During his travels in the East, he seems to have forgotten the kind of views regarding Scripture dominant in his Church at home. It would be exceedingly interesting to know what Mr. Parry would consider to be the teaching of Protestantism, on, say, Baptism, the Eucharist, Confession and Eternal Punishment. A kind of insinuation pervades the book that Syrian converts to Rome are animated mostly by interested motives. Could it be possible—this of course is merely a suggestion—that the old Syrians stretch out their hands to England with a view not so much to spiritual as financial aid?

J. A. H.

Cursus Sacræ Scripturæ. Commentarius in Genesim, auctore Francisco de Hummelauer, S.J. Parisiis: Sumptibus P. Le-thiellieux, editoris. 1895.

THE Commentary on Genesis, in the "Cursus Sacræ Scripturæ," in process of publication by the German Jesuits, has been looked forward to with interest for some time past by Catholic Biblical students. The more so as Father Hummelauer was known to be the author of the coming volume—a man who had already acquired a reputation by his writings on the historical books of the Old Testament. "Genesis" has at last appeared, doubtless to be soon followed by the remaining books of the Pentateuch; and it may safely be said that, in his latest publication, Father Hummelauer maintains the high reputation for learning and scholarship he had already earned by his earlier contributions to the "Cursus Sacræ Scripturæ." Needless to say, Father Hummelauer defends the traditional view as to the Mosaic authorship; explaining, in the course of the volume, the reasons which lead him to reject the critical analysis of Genesis, as it is set forth by modern scholars.

Father Hummelauer excuses himself from prefacing his commentary with an exhaustive discussion of the question of the Pentateuch, referring his readers for information on the subject to Father Cornely's treatment of it in the general introduction. It must not be imagined, however, that he proceeds to comment on the text

without any introductory remarks. On the contrary he sets forth his views as to the composition of Genesis, in an essay of some forty-five pages; and, whether one agrees or not with the explanation therein defended, it will be acknowledged by all that Father Hummelauer displays, in the defence of his position, great learning and familiarity with biblical literature, both ancient and modern.

Father Hummelauer is far from denying that the author of Genesis drew his information as to the facts set forth in Genesis from sources, whether in the shape of oral or written traditions; on the contrary, he holds such to have been certainly the case. But he entirely repudiates the contention of the "hypercritical" school, that these sources contained "not genuine history nor true revelations, but popular myths"; and ridicules the confidence with which modern critics split up the different sections of Genesis, assigning chapters, verses, or even words to different writers. The arguments brought forward in support of this minute analysis—viz., diversity in the use of the names of the Divinity, repetitions and contradictions, and differences of style, are then submitted to examination and rejected; either as false or quite consistent with the theory as to the composition of Genesis, defended by the author.

So far Father Hummelauer's work has been mostly negative. He now proceeds to build up a theory of his own. Taking Genesis as a whole, he shows that it contains three distinct strata of traditions, welded together at a later day, by a redactor—the redactor being of course none other than Moses. The first stratum, *stratum Adamicum* or *prænoeticum*, extends from the beginning of the book to the deluge. The second, *stratum noeticum* or *præabrahamicum* embraces the traditions (besides those mentioned above) which Abraham brought with him from Senaar—e.g., the account of the flood, the deeds and progeny of Noe, the genealogy of Sem. The third stratum, called *Abrahamicum* or *præmosaicum*, is made up of such traditions as had their origin after the departure from Senaar.

Now it will readily be conceived that these three strata must have differed very much from one another in style; nay more, that even the traditions contained within one stratum must have manifested very considerable variations in that respect, seeing that each group of traditions was the growth of centuries. Father Hummelauer has accordingly no difficulty in accounting, on his theory, for divergences of style in Genesis; and, throughout the commentary, wherever modern critics strive to prove diversity of authorship from difference of style, he tries to show that the diversity of style implies no more than may be allowed, consistently with Mosaic authorship.

Finally, Father Hummelauer discusses the rôle of Moses, whom

he calls the "redactor seu libri auctor." It was he who first collected into one volume the various "generations" (תולדות), contained in the three above-mentioned strata, adding certain passages from other sources (as the generations of Ismael and Esau), and whatever explanations were necessary for the right understanding of the whole.

Such are Father Hummelauer's views as to the composition of Genesis; and they are enlarged upon and defended throughout the commentary with great lucidity and ability. It will be satisfactory to many students to know that the cautious author leaves the question of the non-universality of the deluge *quoad homines* an open one.

It would be affectation to pretend to believe that Father Hummelauer's work will have any appreciable effect in modifying the views of the followers of the Higher Criticism, whether rationalistic or otherwise. Perhaps it is a mistake to isolate the question of the authorship of Genesis. It would seem that the whole Pentateuch—leaving Josue out of the question—is so bound up together, that the authorship of one part cannot be satisfactorily discussed without reference to the rest. Father Hummelauer's hypothesis as to Genesis is plausible. But what if it be said, as of course all critics will say, that the styles of the strata of Genesis do not stop with Genesis. They go on unchanged throughout the Hexateuch. Such an objection cannot be passed over in these days by any writer expecting a patient hearing from both sides. It goes to the very root of Father Hummelauer's contention. And however plausible or ingenious a theory may be, it will have no practical effect upon a great controversy, unless it be shown to supply an answer to such an objection as the one suggested above.

J. A. H.

Publications of the Catholic Truth Society. London: 18 West Square, S.E.

A ZEALOUS Catholic bookseller in a small country town was lately lamenting to us the lack of short Catholic stories of the class supplied in great quantities by non-Catholic agencies, and frequently made the vehicle for anti-Catholic teaching. He was convinced that he could distribute many such tales if they were not too openly religious, and if they did not bear the name of the "Catholic Truth Society." His customers who were all Protestant would not take anything with that name on its front. Perhaps the

Society which is already doing so much to distribute cheap Catholic reading might consider whether it could satisfy this demand and reproduce in popular form some of the many good stories which appear in our newspapers, withholding their distinctive name from the title-page and leaving only their address. We were reminded of the suggestion by "The Price of the Pearl," by Baroness Pauline von Hügel, which, together with "Joan of Arc," by Lady Amabel Kerr, are the principal publications forwarded to us for notice this quarter. The former contains four interesting and romantic tales drawn from the heroic days of English martyrs and confessors, and bearing mainly on mixed marriages. The latter tells in choice and simple language the tragic story of the Maiden Martyr of France, whom we are glad to see called by the anglicised name which has been familiar to us all from childhood. Lady Amabel is perhaps a little severe on the aggression and usurpation of our English kings, still her beautiful book will help to increase amongst us devotion to the Holy Maid of Orleans, whose beatification would be as popular in England as in France.

The Biographical Department includes an interesting sketch by Mr. Kegan Paul of the "Seven Holy Founders of the Servite Order"; a life of Palestrina, and one of "B. Margaret Mary," also by Lady Amabel Kerr. "Ireland's Spiritual Shamrock" is a reproduction of the well-known excellent Lives of St. Patrick, St. Brigid, and St. Columba. There is also a devout account of "St. Frances of Rome," whose marvellous story deserves to be better known as an example to women living in the world. In "Dom Maurice Chauncy and Brother Hugh Taylor," D. Lawrence Hendriks tells the story of two Carthusian Confessors for the faith who just missed the crown of martyrdom, but lived to carry on in Flanders the glorious line of the London Charter House.

Amongst controversial tractates we notice a timely one on "The Sacrifices of Masses" condemned in the Thirty-nine Articles, which Anglicans attempt to distinguish from the Sacrifice of the Mass; another by F. Sydney Smith on the "Disappearance of the Papacy," one of Dr. Littledale's wonderful discoveries; and some good leaflets on "Communion in one Kind," "How to Become a Catholic," &c. &c. "Fair Treatment for Honest Work" is a reprint of one of the admirable papers on Social Questions which Abbot Snow has been writing lately. Dr. Gasquet's article in our last October number on "The Cures at Lourdes" has also been reprinted. Some excellent devotional tracts for a halfpenny or a penny conclude the list of this quarter's publications.

A Literary History of the English People. From the Origins to the Renaissance. By J. J. JUSSEMAND. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1895. Pp. 545.

M. JUSSEMAND is already well known as the author of scholarly works, both in English and in French, dealing with the mediæval period of English literature. The present volume is, we learn and hope, only the first instalment of a work that will traverse the whole field of our literary history.

The realms of our literature are ever extending their boundaries, in the older periods by the discovery, deciphering, and printing of works hitherto unknown or unavailable, and in the modern days by the rich legacies left behind by the great writers who have but recently passed away. Our language reaches back into the shadows of a dim antiquity; it is traceable to many various sources; it has undergone great changes; it has found many to describe it and the works which it has produced. Hence it is, as the author states in his preface, that it is quite necessary nowadays, for any writer who would venture to treat of our literary history, to specialise his labour, and "to make with particular care the kind of observations for which circumstances have fitted him best." He therefore proposes to discuss our literature in connection with the people and the nation; that is to say, alongside of the origin and growth of the people and of its national sentiment and character, he will exhibit the manner in which they found expression in language down through the ages to the present day. Of course to be profitable this process must be a continuous one; it must extend through periods when the national sentiment found utterance in a language not its own.

The author proposes to carry out this idea in three volumes, the first volume "telling the literary story of the English up to the Renaissance; the second up to the accession of King Pope; the last up to our own day." The volume to hand, though only the opening part of the projected work, is really complete in itself. It is divided into three books. Book I. gives the "origins" of the nation and its language; and in four chapters treats of the Celts and the Roman invasion of Britain, narrates the Germanic conquests and the characteristics of the national poetry of the Anglo-Saxons, and lastly, considers the Christian literature and the prose writings of the period, whether in Latin or Anglo-Saxon.

Book II. also consists of four chapters. After an explanation of the results of the battle of Senlac, we are shown how French was superimposed on the English language; how the resulting literature in French, animated by a mingling of Norman and Saxon feeling,

blossomed into song and story. The histories, chronicles, &c., in Latin are next discussed, and then the English translations of pious works.

Book III. contains seven chapters. The importance of the subject rises. Hitherto the author has been engaged in tracing the sources and course of different streams of sentiment and naturality. He has now found their point of confluence, and, standing for a moment at the meeting of the waters, gazes at the swelling tide of a single national life as it forges on its course. The various elements have amalgamated. "Norman and Saxon and Dane are we, but all of us one"—English. England is now "merrie England," bursting with life and vigour. Chaucer is the outcome, the first great spokesman of the new nation, the welder of the various elements and dialects, the moulder of the language for ages to come. Some minor poets claim short consideration, Gower a more lengthy notice. Then follows a long and able chapter on William Langland, the author of "Piers the Ploughman." The first place among the prose writers of the fifteenth century is given to John Wyclif. After that follows an interesting account of the rise of the theatre out of the old dialogues and mysteries, and a description of the close of the Middle Ages.

It will be abundantly plain from this short summary how broad and comprehensive is the survey taken by M. Jusserand, and how comparatively fresh is the point of view from which it is made.

Trite though the saying is, it is none the less true that we are the creatures of our circumstances. And as it is with individuals, so is it with nations. The national sentiment and its literary expression are the outcome of the natural disposition, as modified by locality, by intercommunication with other peoples for war or commerce, and by intermingling with those other racial elements out of which a nation has sprung.

It is just this relation between the history of a people and the phases of its literature which, in many cases, the general reader and even the studious scholar are at a loss to discern. M. Jusserand has set himself to work to lessen, and, if possible, to remove the difficulty. We are happy to be able to say that he has, in our opinion, performed his task so far with no small measure of success. The object in view was no easy one to attain. Not only is there needed an intimate and first-hand knowledge of our literature, its writers and their works, but also a clear and well-balanced view of our national history. The work thus becomes a mixture of the history of the nation and of its literature, each explanatory of the other. M. Jusserand has managed well. He is clear, full of information, and always interesting. He is thoroughly conversant with our literature.

We are continually met, up and down the book, by appreciative estimates and comparisons, which shows much acuteness, and also by valuable hints and explanations which make clear a great deal.

Speaking of the difficulty there is in dating the literary work of the Anglo-Saxon period, M. Jusserand says :

The purely Germanic period of the literary history of England lasted six hundred years, that is for about the same length of time as divides us from the reign of Henry III. Rarely has a literature been more consistent with itself than the literature of the Anglo-Saxons. They were not as the Celts, quick to learn; they had not the curiosity, loquacity, taste for art which were shown in the subjugated race. They developed slowly. Those steady qualities which were to save the Anglo-Saxon genius from the absolute destruction that threatened it at the time of the Norman Conquest resulted in the production of literary works evincing, one and all, such a similitude in tastes, tendencies, and feelings that it is extremely difficult to date and localise them. At the furthest end of the period the Anglo-Saxons continued to enjoy, Christians as they were, and in more and more intimate contact with latinised races, legends and traditions going back to the pagan days, nay, to the days of their continental life by the shores of the Baltic (p. 38).

Or again, take the following statement of the crisis at hand on the election of Harold II. :

An awful problem had to be solved. Divided, helpless, uncertain, England could no longer remain what she had been for six hundred years. She stood vacillating, drawn by contrary attractions to opposite centres, half-way between the North, that had at last populated the land, and the South that had taught and Christianised the nation. On both sides fresh invaders threaten her; which will be the winner? Should the North triumph, England will be bound for centuries to the Germanic nations, whose growth will be tardy, and whose literary development will be slow, so slow indeed that men still alive to-day may have seen with their own eyes the great poet of the race, Goethe, who died in 1832. Should the South carry the day, the growth will be speedy and the preparation rapid. Like France, Italy, and Spain, England will have at the Renaissance a complete literature of her own, and be able to produce a Shakespeare, as Italy produced an Ariosto, Spain a Cervantes, and France a Montaigne, a Ronsard, and a Rabelais (p. 97).

From these two short extracts some small idea may be gained of M. Jusserand's method of combining history and literature. It will be seen, too, that he has at his command a clear and polished style of English, which, though in places somewhat strongly tinged by a foreign fondness for antithesis, and for the use of the historical present, besides being slightly marred in one or two places by lapses from the general English use of a word, places his meaning before his readers in a manner that is at once lucid, bright, and attractive. He has entered into the spirit of our literature and has overcome so

successfully the difficulties of our language as scarcely to betray his foreign origin.

In a lengthy account of the poet Chaucer is much that is valuable and helpful to a clear understanding of his life and labour. If the chapter may be said to afford any matter for regret, it is that the subject of his talking the East-Midland dialect as the vehicle of his literary expression has not been a little more particularised and developed.

A large space is devoted to John Wyclif, the so-called "Morning Star of the Reformation." M. Jusserand shows how his writings tended to communism, and how the people, accepting his theories without the restrictions which he himself placed upon them, broke out into rebellion. As regards the question of Wyclif's translation of the Bible, M. Jusserand takes it for granted that he did personally translate a large portion of the Bible whilst he supervised the translation of the remainder. This may have to be modified if the doubts which Dr. Gasquet has thrown on the authorship of the Wycliffite Scriptures should be confirmed. At the same time, however, M. Jusserand speaks out plainly as regards the attitude of the pre-Reformation Church towards Scriptures in the vernacular:

To translate the Scriptures was not forbidden. The Church only required that the versions should be submitted to her for approval. There already existed several, complete or partial, in various languages; a complete one in French, written in the thirteenth century, and several partial ones in English (p. 433).

And here we must take leave of M. Jusserand's work, which is as full of enlightened suggestion as its manner of production is satisfactory. Paper and type are good and the margins adequate for neatness. A good index completes the usefulness of the volume, and an interesting heliogravure by Dujardin of Mediæval London is given as a frontispiece.

J. B. M.

Degeneration. By MAX NORDAU. Translated from the Second German Edition. London: William Heinemann.

DR. MAX NORDAU has attempted a daring thing; and he has succeeded, if we may judge by the outcries of every day critics, touched to the quick by his lance. In this brilliant, painful, humorous, keen-edged volume, he walks the hospital of plague-stricken literature, examines the most distinguished patients, notes their symptoms, and sums up their case. His diagnosis cannot be

wanting in horrors; disease and its surroundings are by a divine dispensation almost always ugly; and persons of weak nerves, to say nothing of the reader in quest of amusement, will often be shocked or staggered as they turn over these pages. That, in an age of unchecked publication, may be deplored, but can scarcely be avoided. The writers whom Nordau dissects and reduces to first principles are in every one's hands; their names have gone abroad to the four winds, and Europe bows down to the genius of Ibsen, Tolstoi, Wagner, Zola; of Flaubert, Gautier, and the pre-Raphaelites. If all these exhibit plague-spots, if they are heralds and even captains of an intellectual Black Death, now is the moment to give us warning. For who has not come within their influence? It was time that a physician spoke. Nordau, cool and yet trenchant, an eye always upon the evidence, and qualified by his long readings in modern books, has performed this needful operation. Views will differ as to his success; but there cannot be two opinions regarding his strength as a critic, or the interest which he has thrown over a subject in many ways repulsive.

The German volumes of which Mr. Heinemann now publishes a well-written and fairly idiomatic English version, raised echoes all round Germany when they first came out. They were reviewed on this side of the Channel more than a year ago. Had the writer been orthodox, conservative, and, as Italians speak, a *codino*—in love with the past, timid before the future—his judgment might, perhaps, be suspected. He is, however, none of these things. Nordau, like Professor Huxley, whose pure agnosticism he shares, believes neither in God nor devil, laughs at metaphysics and theology, which he calls idle chatter, takes his stand upon molecules and their mixtures, follows the method of Lombroso, is a hard-headed Rationalist, in social doctrine a reformer, and utterly disdainful of what he has smitten with anathema as “conventional lies.” It is important to bear this in mind. There seems to be no valid reason why Christians should be forbidden to judge of modern literature by their own standard, as other schools have done, and will always do. But Nordau is in no sense a Christian. If he feels bound to speak of widespread disease, to admonish decadents, and to blow the trumpet against the hosts of Ibsen—against Realism, Diabolism, Nietzsche, and Maeterlinck—he cannot be ruled out of the lists as a Don Quixote from the reactionary training-grounds, or told to sit down as one behind the age.

“Mystics, Ego-maniacs, and Realists,” such are the classes into which he divides his patients. The catalogue is a long one. English readers will turn with some curiosity to the very unkind observa-

tions—often in the sledge-hammer style—that Nordau has made upon Ruskin and the esthetic movement, on “Nora” and “Hedda Gabler,” on “Ivan Ilyitch” and the “Kreutzer Sonata.” We may disagree, but, unless quite fanatical, we shall be excessively amused. A new and most laughable “Martinus Scriblerus” might be composed from his happy and absurd citations. It is difficult for a man of science not to satirise the loose talk about heredity, spinal complaint, and exact prognosis in “Ghosts” and “A Doll’s House.” It ought to be impossible for any one, layman or professional, to put faith in Tolstoi’s judgment, after reading his melancholy admissions that he has been, more than once, all but out of his mind. The pretended—shall we say the insolent and presumptuous?—realism of Zola is blown to atoms when Nordau has shown its origin and resources to be, not the average experience of Paris life, nor the observation of facts at large, but a set of criminal *dossiers* dealing with the family of Kérangel which for a space of some ninety years yielded its abnormal harvest to the prison, the almshouse, and the asylum. What, moreover, can be alleged as a counterpoise to the charges brought against Richard Wagner, from his prose writings and the incredible caricatures of old German or Scandinavian legends which he has wrought into tableaux vivants accompanied by “endless melody,” and a Leit-motif? Will these shreds and patches bear looking at in broad daylight? And can Wagner be acquitted of anarchic tendencies, of doing homage to emotions which never yet made for righteousness, of disorder in his dramatic conceptions, and of exploiting for stage-effect the most sacred memories? To Nordau it seems that all this revival of associations long discredited, this romantic, mystic, mediæval, or Renaissance trumpery employed for the purpose of rousing sentiments to which no genuine beliefs correspond, is a pernicious hypnotism. Religion it is not, nor creative genius, nor art which can endure. It is mere religiosity, imitation without life, and perilous self-indulgence; it marks the overthrow of reason by reverie, the usurpation of the lower nerve-centres to the detriment of the higher, and a growing brain-fatigue. Men talk of progress and evolution; what they should guard against is degeneracy. Their vital strength is lessening, for the tax upon it grows every day.

Hence the reign of sentimentalism, the thirsting for sensations, the inconstancy of effort, the cloud that darkens ideas, the contradictions swarming on every page of the Verlaines and the Whitmans; hence the universal bric-à-brac, as in a Jew’s warehouse, and the disappearance from modern life of simplicity, *cujus non audeo dicere*

nomen, exclaimed, in not unlike circumstances, the most mordant of Roman satirists. Symptoms are, in short, visible among the upper classes everywhere, but especially in great European capitals like Paris and Vienna, which point to a moral decadence. They are not wanting nearer home.

Nordau's witness to these phenomena is one thing, his explanation another. We cannot, of course, accept a psychology founded upon Materialism; and much of the medical lore heaped up in his too confident periods will be put aside as debateable or exaggerated. Yet the formula of the balance which he employs would seem to convey some important truth, when cleared of its agnostic associations. There ought to be, as he contends, an equilibrium between the healthy organism and the objects on which it reacts. So long as it does react with promptness and vigour, it is in a normal condition; wherever it fails, in an abnormal. And it proves the failure by insanity, self-absorption, dreaming with open eyes, the tyranny of coercive ideas. The degenerate have their own marks, which Lombroso has found in asylums, and which Nordau, somewhat ruthlessly—himself, under the German “coercive idea” of system—fixes upon novels, plays, poems, and essays that have sold by the hundred thousand. Let us abate from the evidence all *à priori* suggestions; two things force themselves upon our view, notwithstanding, as undeniable.

One is the significant spectacle of a modern who recoils in disgust from conclusions, practices, and rules of conduct excused, if not justified, by the Materialism in which he puts his faith. Dr. Nordau warns the decadent that he is running on destruction; but if a man may please himself, why, in the name of pleasure (and it is all our physician appeals to) should he not? Thus the agnostic publishes his own *reductio ad absurdum*. But the second thing left when we have cast away all possible mistakes and false judgments in the volume is this, that religion cannot be deemed superfluous though physical science should, in the hands of eminent professors, have done its utmost to banish the transcendental from men's minds, or secular politics (as in France and Italy) have taken Auguste Comte for their guide. When the wise and the foolish are talking of “reaction”; when they murmur against teachers who promised them, in the name of molecules, “laws of conduct” as well as “laws of comfort,” and have not kept their promise; when disease invades literature, and a Max Nordau comes forward to urge upon governments the need of an Index Expurgatorius, and to denounce the abnormal which for so many has taken the place left vacant by the supernatural, who can resist a suspicion—it has long haunted serious

persons—that if the men of the laboratory and the scalpel had been more modest, these degenerates would never have found an audience, nor would popular applause be given to writers no less corrupt in principle than in style and treatment far below the classics of great nations?

W. B.

Une Vie inédite de S. Émilion d'après le ms Y 1 de l'Archevêché de Bordeaux. Par M. le CHANOINE E. ALLAIN. Bruxelles: Imprimerie Polleunis et Ceuterick. 1894.

THE name of St. Émilion usually suggests a claret purporting to come from a ravine of the Dordogne; only this and nothing more. Such is fame. The holy man himself is as unknown to the bulk of those who invoke him at the dinner table, as the taste of the wine dedicated, with or without permission, to his memory was probably unknown to the saint himself. Notices of his life are few and brief, and these have long lain buried under dust and cobwebs in ill-kept libraries. To the learned keeper of the Bordeaux diocesan records we owe the return to light of a forgotten and unedited manuscript life of St. Émilion. It was Canon Allain's good fortune to discover this valuable biography within the yellow pages of a forgotten twelfth-century MS. marked Y 1 in the episcopal archives of Bordeaux. A description of manuscript Y 1 will interest many of our readers. "It was," says the editor, "quite a little library for the canons regular of St. Emilion. It contains an Adonian Martyrology . . . ; an Obituary; the Rule of St. Augustine with explanation; numerous selections from the Fathers; the Life of the Founder of the Monastery; rubrics; liturgical excerpts, of which some are set to music; two Bulls of Leo IX. and Adrian IV; notices of donations; association of prayers in which several abbeys joined St. Émilion." Who the author of the *Vita* was, or when it was written, Canon Allain has not been able to discover. It cannot have been written earlier than the ninth century. Mabillon's statement about the secularisation of the regular chapter of St. Émilion is proved to be incorrect, for the secular canons did not displace the ancient stall-holders before 1309. The French editor also calls attention to the labours of Weale and Misset in the liturgical field, and gives us a portion of and sequence for St. Émilion's feast taken from the W. & M.'s invaluable *Analecta Liturgica*. In his reproduction of the *Vita*, Canon Allain has brought the spelling up to date, corrected evident slips of the copyist, and

then, with a thoughtfulness which antiquarians will know how to estimate, has printed the slips, such as they are, in the margin. The history of the saint occupies but little space in this fasciculus. Short as it is, however, it will be found worth reading, and lovers of hagiology will be grateful to the Bordeaux *savant* for the pains he has taken to bring out a scholarly edition of the recently disinterred *Vita Sti Emilionis*. A facsimile page of the MS. Life is given in frontispiece.

G. H.

Charity is the Greatest Created Gift of God to Man. By the Very Rev. J. A. MALTHUS, O.P. London: Burns & Oates. 1s.

DEVOUT and loving souls will welcome another small treatise by Fr. Malthus. Solidly based on the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, these pages supply both light for the understanding and food for the heart. The greatest created gift of God is briefly studied and its use strongly and effectively inculcated. Divine Love, like every other love, is best learnt by loving. Fully aware of this law of our being, the learned Dominican writer has skilfully strung together doctrine and prayer, rules and exercises. Here we have a passage where St. Thomas teaches that fervent charity towards God, consumes all venial sins, and here we have petitions full of fire addressed to the Most Blessed Trinity. The example of Blessed Magdalene de Panateriis, Virgin of the Third Order of St. Dominic, is given at p. 27 to drive home the lesson of love for the Holy Name, and at p. 23 we are taught the loving aspirations of St. Bernardine of Siena. This tiny manual of charity is well printed and neatly bound.

G. H.

A Royal and Christian Soul. By Mgr. D'HULST. Washbourne. 1895. 2s.

THIS little book is a touching tribute paid to the memory of his Royal Highness Philippe, Comte de Paris, by his life-long friend and spiritual adviser the Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris. The eloquent prelate does not attempt to describe the career of the late prince, or to supply the partisans of monarchy with a political treatise.

My aim [writes Mgr. d'Hulst in the preface to his work] has been a study of character, the portrayal of a soul. . . . Political questions are, indeed, continually referred to, but from one point of view only—that of the conscience of the Prince.

The author begins by showing the difference between the world's and God's estimate of greatness :

A life to appear great in the eyes of man, must [according to the Parisian rector] combine three elements which are not always found together : outstanding abilities, the effort necessary to develop them, and, lastly, the favour of fortune. God, happily, is more just. . . . He reserves His supreme approval for virtue alone.

The virtues of the grandson of Louis Philippe are dealt with in moderate language : his modesty, loyalty, love of union, regard for Divine Revelation. One of the desires he expressed was to see the moral influence of religion encouraged, especially in schools, without compromising it by too intimate a connection with the State ; but the anti-Christian education laws of his native country he detested and condemned. Only six weeks before his death the Comte de Paris wrote :

For [France] to rise again, she must become once more a Christian nation. A nation which has lost the sense of religion, where men's passions are no longer curbed by any moral restraint, *where sufferers find no motive for resignation in any hope of a future life*, is doomed to . . . become the prey of its enemies within and without.

Though brought up by a Lutheran mother, the Prince was thoroughly grounded in all Catholic practices and principles, and this training kept always alive in him true self-respect and reverence for the things of God. His married life was one of closest affection and unclouded happiness. Visitors to any of the Comte's places of residence may have remarked two writing-tables placed side by side. At one the Prince used to work, at the other the Princess ; and these tables thus touchingly symbolised that perfect union which nothing was suffered to interrupt, and which bound soul to soul even in the midst of work and study. Great was the charity of the Prince, who distinguished himself by liberality to the poor, to charitable institutions, to schools, to Peter's Pence. The cross, without which no virtue can be perfected, was heavily pressed upon the shoulders of the Comte de Paris, but in prayer he found strength to bear its salutary burden. As the hour of judgment drew nearer, his intercourse with our Divine Lord and His Holy Mother became closer. He received more frequently the sacrament of life and love, he deepened, by systematic reading, his knowledge of spiritual things. The death of the Prince was what might have been

expected from the elevated sentiments, the perfect uprightness, constant application to duty, firm and humble faith and profound piety which had distinguished his life. The Benedictine translator, Dom Oswald Hunter Blair, has, by his easy and idiomatic English, done full justice to a book whose style is as graceful as its subject is fascinating. G. H.

The Jewish Race in Ancient and Roman History. From the Eleventh Revised Edition of A. RENDU, LL.D. Translated by THERESA CRODHU. London: Burns & Oates.

FIRST let us say that this should prove a very useful book. Living as we do among a people who, for the most part, consider a knowledge of Old Testament history a knowledge of religion, it is desirable that we should be better acquainted with it than English Catholics usually are, and the ninety-three pages, giving "The History of the Jews," in this work might be carefully crammed by the Faithful—both old and young—in this country, with very great advantage. And now for a word or two of friendly—*very* friendly—criticism.

We think the title-page might have been more explicit. An ordinary reader might very fairly say: "Who was A. Rendu, LL.D.? When did he live? From what language did Mrs. or Miss Theresa Crodhu translate his book? The work, again, is without any preface or introduction of any kind. There is something wonderfully familiar, and at the same time unfamiliar, in the opening words: "In the commencement, God created the heaven and the earth." In passing, let us observe that in so tightly compressed a book as this, "beginning," being a shorter word, would have been more suitable than "commencement," to say nothing of its being an infinitely better word in other respects. Then comes a condensation of the first few chapters in Genesis, which is followed by a summary of the historical matter in the rest of the Old Testament. Early in the book we come to dates, such as "Adam had another son named Seth (4834-3934)," and a few lines further on, we read of "Henoch (4342-3978)." The student would naturally ask: Why these discrepancies in the dates? What are the authorities from which they are taken? Of the literary style and lucidity of the book, the following account of the beautiful story of Ruth may be given as an example.

During this epoch God led *Ruth*, a poor Moabitish woman, toward one of her relatives named *Boaz*, a rich inhabitant of Bethlehem, who, touched

by her love for *Noemi*, her mother-in-law, took her in marriage. Of this union had to be born *Obed*, who gave the day to Isai, father of King David.

As we said, at starting, the first ninety-three pages, dealing with Jewish history, contain much that is valuable, and we should advise Catholics, who are not well versed in the subject, to make up their minds to tolerate their dry, jerky style, and to read them, study them, and thoroughly master them.

After this first part on the "History of the Jews," comes the second, on "Ancient History, properly so-called," in three divisions: Africa, Asia, and Europe. Then comes the third part, on "The History of Rome," likewise in three divisions: "The Monarchical Government," "The Roman Republic," and "The Roman Empire and the Church." Both the second and the third part contain a great deal of valuable historical information; but, throughout the greater number of these three hundred and five pages, we kept asking ourselves what had become of the "Jewish Race." It is true that it crops up occasionally, but only to disappear again. Summaries of the histories of Greece, Rome and Phœnicia form no treatise on *the Jewish Race in Ancient and Roman History*. Even the history of the Christian Church under the Roman emperors is not a history of the Jews. Altogether, only about one-quarter of the book strictly comes under the subject of its title. We did not grumble at the brevity of the account of Ruth; but when we found that the space devoted to Cleopatra and her doings was ten or twelve times as long, we thought it time for the critics to begin to plead the cause of "The Jewish Race."

The Tragedy of Fotheringay. Founded on the Journal of D. Bourgoing, Physician to Mary Queen of Scots, and on Unpublished MSS. Documents. By the Hon. Mrs. MAXWELL-SCOTT of Abbotsford. London: Adam & Charles Black. 1895. Pp. 272.

AS Brântome wrote three hundred years ago, the historians of Mary Queen of Scots have a choice between two great subjects—her life and her death. Her life was a checkered one, full of strange and violent contrasts. Its days of calm and sunshine were few and early. Crowned Queen in the cradle, she became a widow in early womanhood; surrounded, later on, by enemies in Scotland, she was forced to marry one of the murderers of her

second husband, Lord Darnley; and spent her last years in captivity in the realms of a cousin. There is ample material in all this for the moralist to point a homily on the Vanity of Human Wishes, or on Shakespere's text, "Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown." But this is not all. After a long and anxious captivity, she underwent a mock trial, deprived of all help of counsel and robbed of her private papers. The result of this strange assize was foredoomed: sentence was passed, and at length, after delays, almost as cruel as death itself, she suffered on the block as a felon.

The beauty and the sorrows of Mary Stuart have ever exercised a fascination over the imagination, whilst the mystery enveloping many of the contradictions in her life has furnished additional claims upon the attention of historians. Friend and foe have been busy with her life, and have made her the subject of the wildest praise or of the strongest condemnation. She was a high-spirited woman cast single-handed amid the rancours of Calvinism and the intrigues of a period of transition. Here, doubtless, lies the solution of most of the difficulties in her career. This much is certain. Her life was a block in the way of the Reformers; her accession to the throne of England was dreaded as the certain undoing of the work of Protestantism.

In the volume before us, the Honourable Mrs. Maxwell-Scott has added a charming contribution to the literature dealing with Mary Stuart. She has chosen as her subject the last days and death of the Queen—Brântome's second alternative, which is not darkened or complicated by the difficulties of the first. The aim of Mary's enemies is clear—her death. Mary's position would also seem to be equally clear. She was accused and condemned for having plotted the assassination of Elizabeth. Of this she declared herself innocent to the last, at the same time acknowledging that she certainly had striven to obtain her own deliverance from the captivity in which she had languished so long. From the work now under consideration, it is abundantly evident that, whatever might be the plea put forward, her execution was really a prospective act of defence against the possible restoration of Catholicity in England in the event of her succeeding to the throne. Besides, her name was a thing to conjure with wherever discontent at persecution was rife, and her deliverance formed a plausible pretext before the world to those whose intentions were not limited by an object so blameless.

The title, "*The Tragedy of Fotheringay*," well describes the matter of Mrs. Maxwell-Scott's book. In what the authoress with so much modesty describes as "a short chapter added to the history of Queen Mary," we have the story of the last seven months of Mary Stuart's

life written with a fulness of detail which we shall elsewhere look for in vain in English. The narrative is founded on the journals kept by Dominique Bourgoing, her last physician. He was constantly in attendance upon her during this most trying period, and was present at her trial and her execution. His trustworthiness in all these matters was vouched for by Mary herself in her last letter to Pope Sixtus V., written at Fotheringay, November 23rd, 1586 :

Vous aurez le vrai récit de la fasson de ma dernière prise, et toutes les procédures contre moy et par moy, affin qu'entendant la vérité, les calumnies que les ennemys de l'Eglise me vouedront imposer puissent estre par vous réfutées et la vérité connue : et à cet effet ai je vers vous envoyé ce porteur, réquerant pour la fin votre sainte bénédiction (p. 3).

Bourgoing's journal was acquired at Pliny by M. Chantelauze, and was published by him in France in 1876. Bourgoing's narrative is supplemented by the letters of Sir Amyas Paulet, Mary's keeper, and from contemporary accounts of the execution printed in the Appendix in their entirety and preserved among the State papers. Lord Calthorpe has also courteously assisted the work by loans of documents from the Calthorpe MSS., and by permitting the reproduction of two curious contemporary drawings representing the trial and execution. These drawings are all the more valuable for bearing annotations in the hand of Robert Beale, Clerk of Council to Queen Elizabeth, whose daughter Margaret married Sir Henry Yelverton, Attorney-General, the ancestor of the Calthorpe family. The book also contains three other illustrations of great interest—the Blairs' portrait of Queen Mary which belonged to Elizabeth Curle, one of her women; an enlargement of the execution scene taken from the background of the above, and a portrait from a medallion containing a miniature of Mary Queen of Scots, and relics now in the possession of Lady Milford.

Bourgoing's narrative begins on Thursday, August 11th, 1586. The Babington Plot had been discovered and the conspirators doomed. Mary was implicated by letters which had been intercepted and "doctored" by Walsingham. Paulet, in accordance with his instructions, invited the Queen to ride to Tiscall, a few miles from Chartley, where she was then staying, under the pretence of seeing a buck hunt, but really in order that her cabinets might be rifled and her papers seized. The cavalcade set out on August 16th. On the way Sir Thomas Gorges gave her a message from Elizabeth, and some of her servants, said to be connected with the recent plots, were straightway separated from her. She was not allowed to return to Chartley till the 26th, when she was even deprived of her

money. She left Chartley for ever on September 21st, not knowing whither she was being conveyed, till she finally reached Fotheringay on the 25th.

Chapter III. opens the history of the mock trial, which was commenced on October 15th, and its consequences. Then follows the period of suspense during which Elizabeth was vacillating as to the carrying out of the sentence, and Mary was being subjected to continual indignities. Her last hours on earth are described with graphic detail—her calm and queenly dignity, her loving thought for her servants, her Christian resignation and acceptance of her fate. Sprinkled over the work are her constant protestations of her innocence of any attempt against the life of Elizabeth, and several utterances of her enemies, as well as of her own, which are really priceless testimonies as to the real cause of her death. We do not doubt that this graceful work by Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, with its clear open style, simple and unadorned, yet fascinating from its truthfulness and the absorbing interest of its subject, will give an additional impulse to the movement which has as its object to prove that Mary's death was her martyrdom. The authoress has earned the gratitude of all the adherents of the ill-fated Queen, and will doubtless by her painstaking narrative compel a revision of much that has been written concerning her. We are glad that the little booklet by Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, written for the Catholic Truth Society, has already blossomed into this larger work, which we heartily commend to our readers. The book is sumptuously produced, in a style worthy of its subject.

Appended to the Preface, which is dated February 8th, 1895, is a little note of melancholy interest :

Soon after these words were written my valued friend Father Stevenson was taken from us. He died on the evening of February 8th, the same day on which Queen Mary, whose honour he had done so much to maintain, suffered death, and I, by a further coincidence, finished the writing of this book.

J. B. M.

Geschichte des Breviers. Von P. SUITBERT BÄUMER, Benedictiner der Beuroner Congregation. Freiburg: Herder. 1895. 8vo, xx.-63f. page.

THE late Fr. Bäumer, member of the Benedictine Congregation of Beuron, is favourably known to Catholic readers in England. For some time he acted as sub-prior of the convent of his order in Erdington, near Birmingham; but a stronger claim to the gratitude of English Catholics is to be found in his contributions to English and Irish history in so far as monastic or liturgical questions are concerned. This obligation was further enhanced by his treatise on the English Benedictines at the commencement of the Reformation, and by his exhaustive and critical essay on the Stowe Missal, which made its appearance in the "*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*" (Innsbruck, 1892). Against the maintainers of the theory of an Irish Church independent of Rome, he successfully established the fact that the Stowe Missal, from liturgical evidence, must belong to the first part of the seventh century, and that its liturgical character completely disproves any existence in Ireland of liturgical sources independent from those of Rome. In connection with the controversies between the Abbé Duchesne and Probst, he published in the "*Historische Jahrbuch*," 1893, a learned essay on the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, in which he claimed against the Abbé Duchesne that the Roman liturgy had widely spread throughout France in the period prior to Charlemagne, in opposition to the common opinion hitherto accepted, which ascribed to that Emperor the introduction of the Roman rite in his dominions. Fr. Bäumer's treatise on the Apostolic Creed has been duly noticed in this REVIEW (vol. cxiii. p. 96f.). By his former studies, Fr. Bäumer was singularly well qualified for the task of writing a history of the Breviary. Although he modestly styles it an "Essay," the reader will quickly feel that he has before him the results of the conscientious labours of many years. In addition to the material which he has gathered from the archives and libraries of Italy, Germany, France, and England, the author has laid under contribution the printed literature of his subject in a very exhaustive way. For the part of his work which refers to England he is happy to acknowledge the able assistance of Mr. Edmund Bishop. The developments of the Breviary are traced in three parts through the patristic, mediæval, and post-Tridentine periods. The first part appears to us to rise above the level of former treatises dealing with this period, owing to the recent discoveries of patristic texts which Fr. Bäumer

has so felicitously employed for illustrating his subject. A special interest attaches to his observations on the two currents of ascetical life which may be traced in Egypt and Palestine. The rule of the Palestine monks was introduced into Italy, but the more severe discipline of the monks in Egypt became the standard for Lerins, Southern Gaul, and from Rome found its way to Ireland. For the Middle Ages, Fr. Bäumer, against the conclusions of Abbé Batiffol (*"Histoire du Bréviaire Romain,"* Paris, 1893), proves that it was St. Gregory the Great who gave a new shape to the Divine office. He next gives the result of his researches on the Breviary of the Curia Romana or papal chapel, which, on account of its abridgments, was adopted by the Friars Minor of St. Francis and thus became widely spread throughout Europe. The third part is devoted to a description of the reforms and development of the Breviary from the Council of Trent down to Leo XIII. For minuteness of liturgical references, width of research into ancient and recent literature, and for critical acumen in sifting vexed liturgical questions, this concluding part will take its place as a standard guide to all future students of the history of the Breviary. We may mention the fact that the author has treated with the same thoroughness not a few questions laterally connected with his subject-matter, such as ancient ecclesiastical music and the hymns of the Church. The work is furnished with useful tables and references, and is calculated to render helpful service both to the professor and student of sacred liturgy, and to every priest who wishes to acquire a deeper knowledge of the Breviary, and thereby to deepen his piety in the recitation of the Divine office.

A. B.

Actes de la Captivité et de la Mort des RR. PP. P. Olivaint, L. Ducondray, J. Caubert, A. Clerc, A. De Bengy, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Par le P. ARMAND DE PONLEROY, de la même Compagnie. Seizième Edition. Paris: Téqui Libraire-Editeur, 33 Rue Du Cherche Midi. 1894. Pp. 339.

THIS is an account of the captivity and death of the Jesuits who suffered martyrdom during the reign of the Commune in Paris. The author bases his narrative partly on the testimony of eye-witnesses of the events recorded, and partly on letters written by the martyrs during the six weeks' imprisonment which preceded their execution. Fr. Ponleroy's book has met with great success in

France, where as many as forty thousand copies have been sold. By way of appendix there is added the panegyric on the martyrs which was preached by M. L'Abbé R. Bayle, Vicar-General of Paris.

L'Ancien Clergé de France : Les Évêques pendant la Révolution. Par M. L'Abbé SICARD. Paris: Librairie Victor Le Coffre. 1894. Pp. 513.

M. SICARD devotes some hundred pages to the study of the question which has been so often raised as to the moral worth of the French Bishops before 1789. He quotes in their favour a well-known passage from Burke. Perhaps our readers will more readily recognise the passage in Burke's own words than in M. Sicard's translation of them.

When my occasions took me into France, towards the close of the late reign, the clergy, under all their forms, engaged a considerable part of my curiosity. So far from finding the complaints and discontents against that body, which some publications had given me reason to expect, I perceived little or no public or private uneasiness on their account. On further examination, I found the clergy, in general, persons of moderate minds and decorous manners. I had not the good fortune to know a great many of the parochial clergy; but in general I received a perfectly good account of their morals, and of their attention to their duties. With some of the higher clergy I had a personal acquaintance, and of the rest in that class a very good means of information. They were, almost all of them, persons of noble birth. They resembled others of their own rank; and where there was any difference, it was in their favour. They were more fully educated than the military noblesse; so as by no means to disgrace their profession by ignorance, or by want of fitness for the exercise of their authority. They seemed to me rather a superior class; a set of men amongst whom you would not be surprised to find a Fénelon. I saw among the clergy in Paris men of great learning and candour; and I had reason to believe that this description was not confined to Paris. . . . You had before your Revolution about an hundred and twenty bishops, a few of them were men of eminent sanctity, and charity without limit. . . . When I was in France I am certain that the number of vicious prelates was not great. Certain individuals amongst them, not distinguishable for the regularity of their lives, made some amends for their want of the severe virtues, in their possession of the liberal; and were endowed with qualities which made them useful in the Church and State.

But the greater portion of the book is engaged with the vicissitudes of the French prelates during the Revolution. The fall of the clergy from their position as first order of the State, the spoliation of the Church, the levelling of the bishops to the condition of salaried functionaries of the State, the attitude of the bishops towards the

new political constitution &c., are related in a series of interesting chapters.

Revealed Religion from the "Apologie des Christenthums" of Franz Hettinger, D.D., Professor of Theology at the University of Wurzburg. Edited, with an Introduction on the Assent of Faith, by HENRY SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. 1895. Pp. 203.

HETTINGER'S "Apologie des Christenthums" in the original and in translations has had a very wide circulation on the Continent. It well deserves the high reputation it enjoys. Its learned author was one of the very ablest controversialists of the day. He had no mean acquaintance with science, he was pre-eminent as a philosopher and a theologian; and in the "Apologie" we find the matured results of his life's thought and reading. It is a matter of no surprise then that his work is regarded as a classical and standard work not only by Catholic laymen, but also by distinguished theologians like M. Hurter, whose treatises on Revelation and Christianity abound in references to the famous "Apologie." Some three years ago, Fr. Sebastian Bowden of the London Oratory edited an English version of the first volume of the "Apologie," under the title of "Natural Religion." In "Natural Religion" the existence and providence of God, the immortality of the human soul, and the necessity of divine worship as an inevitable consequence of the relations between the Creator and the creature, are established; while Materialism, in its many forms, and Pantheism are refuted. Fr. Bowden now provides us with an English version of the second volume of the "Apologie," under the title of "Revealed Religion." "Natural Religion" was a very valuable addition to English Catholic literature, but it seems to us that "Revealed Religion" is a more valuable addition still. There were already works in English that traversed the same ground as "Natural Religion," though perhaps none that we could so strongly recommend. But we know of no other work in English that covers the ground of "Revealed Religion." "Revealed Religion," like "Natural Religion," is chiefly constructive. It demonstrates the possibility and necessity of revelation, proves that miracles are possible, cognisable, and constitute with prophecy the genuine *intime* of revelation, establishes the credibility of the Gospels and the Divinity of our Lord, and concludes with an interesting chapter entitled "Christ and Christianity." But, while chiefly

constructive, "Revealed Religion," like "Natural Religion," grapples with the theories and objections of unbelievers. Discussion of all the sceptical theories is of course impossible. Many of them may well be left to die a natural death. "Since 1850," as Fr. Bowden points in his Preface, "there have been published 747 theories regarding the Old and New Testaments, of which 608 are now defunct." But care has been taken to give the leading sceptical arguments a full and fair consideration. Indeed, no one was in a better position to appreciate the force of a difficulty than Dr. Hettinger who composed his monumental work under the fire of infidel German criticism. Fr. Bowden contributes to "Revealed Religion" an introductory essay on the "Assent of Faith," in which, with much clearness and force, he determines the precise theological significance of faith, the nature of the motive of faith, and the nature and values of the motives of credibility which lead to faith; while, in a very useful appendix, Fr. Cator criticises the "Tübingen theory." We strongly recommend "Revealed Religion" to our readers. In conjunction with "Natural Religion" it constitutes a complete defence of Christianity.

Cæremoniale ad usum Alumnorum Seminarii Archiepiscopalis Mechliniensis. Opera J. F. VAN DER STAPPEN. Ep. Titul. Joppen. Mechliniæ: H. Dessain.

The Ceremonies of some Ecclesiastical Functions. By the Rev. DANIEL O'LOAN, Dean, Maynooth College. Second Edition. Dublin: Browne & Nolan, Ltd., Nassau Street. 1895.

Ceremonial according to the Roman Rite. Translated from the Italian of Joseph Baldeschi by the Rev. J. D. HILARIUS DALE. Seventh Edition. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1895.

The Ceremonies of Low Mass. By the Rev. J. HUGHES. Fifth Edition. Dublin: James Duffy Sons & Co.

Roman Hymnal. Part I. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

IT is seldom that we have the satisfaction of calling the attention of the clergy to so large and so useful a number of ceremonial books as is to be found at the head of this notice. Their pages tell of the zeal which stirs the hearts of the priests of God, when there

is question of obedience to the liturgical laws of the Church, or of devout reverence towards the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar.

The first-named work is the fourth and concluding volume of a liturgical series entitled "*Sacra Liturgia*." We strongly recommend it to all Seminarists. It will serve as a text-book during their training, and in after-life will prove a useful manual of ecclesiastical ceremonies. The author, Bishop Van der Stappen, is auxiliary to the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines. It is evident that the work is the fruit of the labour of many years in the diocesan seminary. The method followed is that usually adopted in guides to the duties of the sanctuary. The duties of each office is given consecutively for the whole ecclesiastical year. The ceremonial needed for small churches is also given for each festival. All this is done, as Cardinal Goossens says in his letter of recommendation, "with lucidity and order."

The second ceremonial is from the pen of the learned Dean of Maynooth College. Amongst the many blessings which Catholic Ireland has received from that great College, not the least has been a due appreciation of Church functions and a thorough love of the duties of the Sanctuary. We see that spirit deeply impressed upon every page of Dean O'Loan's ceremonial. We are glad to say that the book is well printed on good paper, for this is always a great consideration.

The third on the list is a reprint of the Rev. Hilarius Dale's *Baldeschi*. That this translation has reached its seventh edition speaks well for its worth and usefulness. Though the large work of Martinucci has, to a great extent, supplanted this English manual, yet we believe that Dale's *Baldeschi* is even now likely to be of the greatest service to the clergy, especially as the present edition contains the pontifical offices for the great festivals of the year. It reflects great credit on the editor. The printing is good, and the size convenient. It ought to be found in every presbytery and in every sacristy.

Hughes on the Mass was fifty years ago the only vernacular guide which the English clergy had for the ceremonies of the holy Sacrifice. It will be still a boon to many, if only for the valuable hints given to priests at the end of the book. It is most useful to be taught what we have to do, but it is perhaps still more useful to learn what we are *not* to do. Father Hughes gives that valuable information to all whose privilege and duty it is to say Mass.

The small Roman Hymnal, which closes the list, will be found useful for congregational singing. To many it would serve as a help to mental prayer.

Biographical Dictionary of the English Catholics. By
JOSEPH GILLOW. Vol. IV. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd.

ENGLISH Catholics are indebted to Mr. J. Gillow for several books connected with the days of persecution, but his Dictionary is the work which will make his name as familiar to their posterity as that of Dodd has been amongst their ancestors for several generations. Any one who takes up this fourth volume will naturally turn at once to the biographical notice given of the late Cardinal Manning. Though the chief events of that eminent prelate's career are well known to most of us, still the able sketch given will be read with interest by every one. The writer acted wisely in keeping clear of points which would be likely to stir up useless controversies. It would have been well if in other less important notices he had been always equally careful.

Throughout the present volume other names, besides that of the illustrious Cardinal, bring back to us the stirring days of the earlier period of the Oxford movement. We are made to realise in the life of Father Lockhart, O.Ch., the many graces that brought those chosen souls to the Church of God, and the personal sacrifices which they all nobly made to return to Catholic Unity.

Several of the Blessed and of the Venerable Martyrs of England occur in these pages. It will suffice to mention the name of Father Lockwood. The fortitude of this aged priest during his trial, and his encouraging words to his brother priest at the scaffold, when the latter's perseverance seemed to be in danger, do not fail even now to touch our hearts and to increase our love of God. No less powerful is the example of those devoted women who in the dark days of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries helped to keep the lamp of Faith burning in their Catholic homes, and whose souls were on fire with zeal for the Church's cause. Such a one was Dorothy Lawson, who built herself a house on a lonely spot by the banks of the Tyne, that the missionary priests when hunted down might there find shelter, and in a Catholic home enjoy days of prayer and peace, till they set forth again to seek for the lost sheep. Her many deeds of charity doubtless obtained for her the then singular privilege of a Catholic and honourable burial.

To come to our own day, we are glad to see a lengthy notice given to the late Right Hon. Sir John Lambert, who was in every way a model layman. Full justice has also been done to the Hon. Charles Langdale and to Mr. Frederick Lucas, who both strenuously upheld the rights of Catholics.

The large-hearted charity which has characterised so many of the wealthy Catholics during the course of the last fifty years, finds a worthy representative in Mr. Daniel Lee of Manchester. Of him Mr. Gillow says: "It has been stated that during his lifetime Mr. Lee gave more than £60,000 for building churches and schools, and for the support of the clergy, which, added to his other charities, must have amounted to no less than £100,000." Verily: "Dispersit, dedit pauperibus; justitia ejus manet."

The hard-working missionary in England, who at the present day spends himself in the duties of his charge, who gathers converts into the fold of the Church, and who wins the respect and honour of his fellow-citizens, has his counterpart in the edifying life of the Rev. Francis Martyn, whose memory still lives in the missions of the Midland counties.

We thank Mr. J. Gillow for all these happy and edifying recollections, and we wish him every success in what yet remains to be done. This fourth volume may be said to herald the early completion of his work, for we are assured by the publishers that the fifth and concluding volume will appear in the early autumn of this year.

Anecdota Oxoniensia. Semitic Series. Part VII. The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt. Edited and Translated by B. T. A. EVETTS, M.A. With Notes by A. J. BUTLER, M.A., F.S.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1895.

THE work, which the seventh part of the Semitic Series of "Anecdota Oxoniensia" renders accessible to English readers, is for the most part taken up with an account of the churches and monasteries of Egypt; though "the title supplied by a later hand on fol. 16 of the MS. describes the book as a 'history, containing an account of the districts and fiefs of Egypt.'" The writer of the work was named Abû Sâlih; and Mr. Evetts writes that "the composition of the work may confidently be assigned to the first years of the thirteenth century." As for the copy of the work in the National Library in Paris, to which Mr. Evetts' translation owes its origin, it was completed on May 27, 1348, "as the copyist himself informs us at the end of the book."

The present work is an abridgment of the original, carried out in a very loose way. There is a great want of order and arrangement; and a good deal of unnecessary repetition. The first twenty leaves of the MS. are lost; and M. Evetts conjectures that probably they

contained part of the history of the Armenians in Egypt, with an account of the churches of Lower Egypt and Cairo, and of the monasteries of the Wâdî Habîb.

Much of Abû Sâlih's information regarding the churches and monasteries of Egypt was undoubtedly based upon his own experience, and is consequently of considerable interest. At the same time it is clear that he borrowed at times from the literature in vogue in his time. Thus he was acquainted with the "Book of the Monasteries" of Ash-Shâbushtî, the Biographies of the Patriarchs, a work called in Latin the "Annales Eutychiei," and a number of other writings.

Mr. Evetts says in the introduction to his work: "It is clear that such a work could hardly be worth publication were it not that, in the words of the author, 'he has here collected information which is not to be found in the work of any other writer.'" Doubtless the work resembles rather a note-book than a formal history; but for all that it is full of valuable information regarding not only the ecclesiastical but profane history of Egypt.

The only other work in Arabic of a similar character to the present work is the portion of the *Khitat* of Al-Makrîgî treating of the Coptic churches and monasteries. Mr. Evetts has wisely had it affixed as an appendix to the present volume.

J. A. H.

The Origin of the Prymer or Lay Folks' Prayer-book. By EDMUND BISHOP. (An Essay contributed to No. 109 of the Early English Text Society's publications). 8vo. Pp. i.—xxxviii. Published for the Society by Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. London: 1897 (*sic*). Price 10s.

THE origin of the collection of prayers for the laity called in England the Prymer, has long been a *crux* to liturgiologists; and, as far as we know, no attempt has been made to deal with the whole of it. The late Mr. H. Bradshaw, indeed, made the suggestion that the Little Office of our Lady was derived from a special commemorative Office of the Incarnation, to be used during Advent; but this is not merely unsupported by the evidence, but would have the disadvantage of only accounting for one portion of the Prymer. Mr. Bishop, as all who are aware of his unrivalled erudition would expect, has dealt with the subject thoroughly and in a way that carries conviction to the reader. His judgment briefly is this:

That the Prymer consisted of those devotional accretions to the Divine Office, invented first by the piety of individuals for the use of monks in their monasteries, which accretions were gradually and voluntarily adopted in the course of two or three centuries by the secular clergy so generally, that by the fourteenth century they had, by virtue of custom, come to be regarded as obligatory, and practically part of the public daily (or only Lenten) office itself (p. xxxvii.).

He traces clearly the source of all these accretions—the penitential and gradual psalms, the Office of the B.V.M. and of the dead—to St. Benedict of Aniane, the great reforming monk of the ninth century. It is much to be hoped that Mr. Bishop will be able to give us a longer account of these prayers, than he could do within the limits of an introductory essay. Every one would like to know the steps by which the Offices of our Lady and the dead came into their present shape—for instance, whether there is any truth in the vague tradition which ascribes the recension now used of the former to St. Bonaventure. At the other end of the history one would be glad to be told how far back these monuments of our forefathers' piety and love of prayer can be traced. There is, of course, no one who could approach Mr. Bishop in the authority with which he would deal with these matters.

Morality and Religion, being the Kerr Lectures for 1893–1894. By REV. JAMES KIDD, B.D., Minister of Erskine Church, Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1895. Pp. 455.

THE purpose of this very able work is to determine the relation of morality and religion to each other. The author analyses the concepts of morality and religion, and proves that, on the one hand, morality has religion as its necessary basis, and, on the other, that religion necessarily has a moral issue. Many indeed who set aside religion as superstition make profession of leading moral lives. But, as Mr. Kidd points out, to the extent that they are moral in conduct even these are under the influence of religion.

Men [says our author] are influenced by movements and principles which they do not recognise, and from which they fancy they have divorced themselves. They cannot separate themselves altogether from the ideas and influences of their time, and these have been in a large measure moulded and coloured by religion. It is, for instance, impossible in this nineteenth century of the Christian era for any one to keep himself entirely free from contact with, and even submission to, Chris-

tianity. The truths proclaimed by Christ are in the very air he breathes. It is not too much to say that the standpoint from which he must regard his surroundings has been fixed by the teaching of Jesus. As a consequence, those who claim to be able to lead moral lives without the aid of Christianity, and who offer their estimate of the world as a substitute for Christianity, are indebted to Christianity for that which gives value alike to their code and their conduct. They are, in truth, fighting Christianity with the weapons that Christianity has put into their hands. This being the case, in dealing with them, what we have to do is not to denounce them as wicked and worthless because they do not acknowledge religion, and in particular the Christian religion, but to show them that their refusal to acknowledge it is not equivalent to their utter rejection of it, that in spite of themselves they have been honouring and applying it, and that the features in their character that lend to them the attraction and moral significance are due to its presence and operation (p. 296).

Mr. Kidd is luminous in statement, cogent in argument, and candid in controversy. We consider his work a very valuable one.

Synopsis tractatus scholastici de Deo Uno. Auctore FERDINANDO ALOISIO STENTRUP, S.J., Oeniponte. Typis et sumptibus Feliciani Rauch. 1895. Pp. 368.

FR. STENTRUP'S *Synopsis* is in its method scholastic rather than positive. This is, no doubt, in great part due to the fact that the subject readily lends itself to philosophical treatment. But whatever the cause may be, the resulting advantage is great. If there is a defect in this otherwise excellent volume, it is that too much space is devoted to controversy. When our author is discussing the much controverted question of the metaphysical essence of God, he contents himself with direct proofs of his own view. But when discussing other controverted points, such as the science of God and the Divine concursus, he devotes page after page to the attempt to prove that the view ordinarily known as the Thomist view is not in accordance with the doctrine of St. Thomas, and then page after page to the attempt to prove that, in any case, it is not in accordance with sound doctrine. Fr. Stentrup is, indeed, not the only offender in this respect; but, considering the very large amount of space that he devotes to these controversies, he is perhaps a graver offender than most. For our part, we should like to see these controversial discussions altogether eliminated from manuals of theology. They do no good. Conversions in these matters are impossible; we are not aware that history records a single instance of a Molinist who has become a Thomist, or a Thomist who has become a Molinist.

Not only do these controversial discussions do no good, but also, it seems to us, when, as is usually the case, undue prominence is given to them in theological text-books, they do a great deal of harm. The student is led, from the amount of space devoted to them, to regard them as the most important questions in the treatise. This is a sad mistake and it is attended by disaster. The student's energy and attention become misdirected, given to what may be or may not be important, and distracted from what, as a matter of faith, actually is. The result is, that instead of assimilating the entire treatise and perceiving it as a symmetrical whole, he carries away with him little more than a confused notion of an interminable, and therefore, to a great extent, useless controversy. Our priests retain a good hold of their Moral theology; but we doubt whether all of them retain a full and accurate knowledge of their Dogmatic theology. The truth is, if we are not mistaken, that some never acquired this knowledge; and the chief obstacle, in our opinion, to this acquisition was the emphasis laid by their best books on the wrong place, the predominance given to questions which intrinsically were altogether secondary. But while we find fault with Fr. Stentrup, for the reason given, we are bound at the same time to admit that his Synopsis is a work of very great utility. Had he treated all the questions which, *salva fide*, may be and are controverted as he treated the controverted question of the metaphysical essence of God, his Synopsis would have been a very perfect work.

Le Saint Sacrifice de la Messe, son explication dogmatique, liturgique, et ascétique. Par le Docteur NICOLAS GIHR. Traduit par l'Abbé L. T. MOCCAND. Two vols. Paris : L. Lethielleux. 1894.

IN his words of approbation prefixed to these volumes, the Bishop of Annecy remarks on the patient completeness of a work by a German writer as contrasted with the briefer and lighter treatment characteristic of French authors; and he attributes the difference to their respective readers. "Le lecteur français est aisément découragé," he says, "et rebuté par l'ampleur et le poids des volumes qu'on lui présente"; or, at all events, so thinks the French author; the German, on the contrary, knows his friends are plodding and patient, and he writes with thoroughness accordingly. This is praise for the German; and Dr. Gihl's book may assuredly take a large share of it. It is both substantial and complete; it is the work of

a man of wide reading and also of deep piety, a very pleasing flavour of which prevades his erudite pages. The first part of the work, called "Dogmatic," occupies 250 pages, and is devoted to a sufficiently popular exposition of theological teaching as to sacrifice: its history and meaning, the efficacy of the Jewish sacrifices, the reality and character of the sacrifice of the Cross, the application of its merits, the truth and efficacy of the sacrifice of the Christian altar, the Mass. It will be very acceptable to many, even among the clergy, to have the pith of the large treatises thus readily accessible in a consecutive and readable context of sufficient fulness. The second part of this work is liturgical and ascetic, and contains a detailed exposition of the Order of the Mass; each ceremony, prayer—often every sentence of a prayer—are separately commented on or paraphrased. Whatever in the history of the introduction or development of rites is likely to interest the general reader is given in sufficient detail, together with such references to more technical treatises as will enable a student to pursue his studies with fuller effect. We begin with descriptions of the Christian altar: its decoration, the chalice, the altar linen, vestments, use of lights, finally, the language of the liturgy. The completeness of treatment in each part of this treatise may be estimated from the fact that three pages are devoted to the use and significance of flowers, and twenty-five pages to explaining the symbolism of the eucharistic vestments. Every statement made is ratified by references in foot-notes, of which every page in the two volumes has its share, and the clergy will find also a happy choice of patristic extracts which will be valuable. Having got the priest vested—not without reference to the spiritual dispositions which ought to animate him—we have a section consisting of twenty-six pages devoted to the psalm *Judica* and the Confession at the foot of the Altar. This section includes a digression on the sign of the Cross and its significance and power, a translation and paraphrase of the psalm in the sense it is then used, a digression on the Doxology, and a detailed explanation of the Confiteor and its appropriateness, &c., the whole interspersed, as occasion offers, with spiritual reflections and suggestions in the spirit of piety which charmingly characterises these volumes. Patiently and with similar completeness each prayer, each action of the priest is treated in turn, to the end of the eucharistic action. An English work executed on the same lines as Dr. Gihl's, in somewhat less diffuse style, however, would be a great boon: what more instructive and interesting study for any Catholic layman or woman than a historical and devotional explanation of that august rite of the Holy Sacrifice as we have it, whose history goes back through

countless careful provisions and adaptations of generations of Popes, away into the simple brevity of the catacombs? Truly we have an inheritance of primitive prayer and ancient ceremony preserved to us through persecution and the care of centuries; not to inquire into the history of our heirloom is to leave ourselves blind to half its charms. Meanwhile we cordially recommend this cheap and well-printed edition to those who can avail themselves of it.

Tractatus de Intellectus Emendatione. Translated from the Latin of Benedict de Spinoza by W. HALE WHITE. Translation revised by AMELIA HUTCHISON STIRLING, M.A. (Edin.). London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1895. Pp. 62.

THIS is a very curious little treatise. The style is rough, the *lacunæ* are numerous, the connection between the various parts is at times very difficult to perceive, the termination is abrupt and unexpected. Nevertheless, Mr. Hale White, who is an enthusiastic admirer of Spinoza, finds comfort in the fact that Bruder has described the treatise, in spite of its many imperfections, as an *aureus libellus*. The aim of the treatise is to determine the mode of acquiring permanent joy, that is to say, the highest good. The highest good, according to Spinoza, consists in the union of mind with the whole of nature. The purpose of the treatise is, then, to set before us the means by which this union may be effected. In pursuance of this object Spinoza states the various modes by which knowledge may be acquired, and declares that perception through essence or knowledge of the proximate cause is the most perfect mode. He next discusses the grounds of certainty, distinguishes true from other ideas, and theorises upon doubt and memory; while in the second part of the treatise he attempts to discover the mode of acquiring clear and distinct ideas which shall be the counterpart of nature and give us insight into the uniformity of nature. Mr. White contributes a preface of some length as an introduction to the treatise.

Reviews in Brief.

Ben Jonson. Vol. II. Mermaid Series of the Best Plays of the Old Dramatists. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1894. Pp. 442. —We have already noticed other volumes in this series of reprints of old dramatists. The present volume contains “Bartholomew Fair”; “Cynthia’s Revels; or, The Fountain of Self-Love;” “Sejanus, his Fall.” The first is a comedy which pours ridicule, rough and strong, on the Puritans, and was a favourite with Charles II. The second is a comical satire; whilst the third is an involved tragedy, bewildering for its want of division and method. Whilst questioning the wisdom of these *literal* reproductions of old texts, which contain in places language which is neither great nor elevating, we cannot refrain from a word of praise for the clearness and neatness of the production of the series.

Elocution Class. A Simplification of the Laws and Principles of Expression. By ELEANOR O’GRADY. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1895. Pp. 180.—This little book, as the authoress states in her preface, is designed to give a knowledge of the fundamental laws and principles of elocution. It is founded largely upon the method of Delsarte; and whilst we do not think that it is likely to prove handy as a class-book, we are sure that to teachers and those old enough to study for themselves, it will prove valuable for its hints and suggestions, which are as clear and practical as they are true.

Œuvres Poétiques d’Adam de St. Victor. Texte Critique, par LÉON GAUTIER, Membre de l’Institut. 3me Édition. Pp. xxii—318. Paris: Picard et Fils. 1894.—It rarely happens that an author is fortunate enough to celebrate the half-jubilee of his principal work by publishing a fresh edition. In the case of the volume before us, it is rather the lovers of sacred poetry—and they are many—who are to be congratulated on having access to an accurately revised text of the Swan of St. Victor.

M. Gautier has profited by the criticisms of the former edition of his book to correct a few details; the main part of it remaining unaffected. Of how many “*editiones principes*” could this be said? As we cannot review in detail, we can here only say that his *apparatus*

criticus seems to us thoroughly scientific. His account, too, is most interesting of the gradual evolution of mediæval Latin poetry, from the stichometric "proses" of Notker to the highly artistic shape given them by the Victorine poet. Adam was the Fra Angelico of mediæval poetry; unrivalled for the sweetness and delicacy of his outlines and colouring; and only failing in the description of the darker passions of a sinful world, from which he was happily sheltered in his peaceful retreat.

Histoire du Bréviaire Romain. Par P. BATIFFOL, du Clergé de Paris. 2me Edition. Pp. 350. Paris: Picard et Fils. 1894.—The first edition of this book has been received with such a general welcome from all whom it concerned, that no words of ours are needed to recommend it to our readers. Although the Abbé Batiffol modestly lays claim to no higher merit than that of being a "vulgarisateur" of the labours of others, he has really done a good deal more. He has verified references, collected scattered statements on the history of the Breviary into a moderate compass, and put the whole into clear and pleasing French, so that the subject may be said to be now accessible for the first time to the general reader. He has had the great advantage of the assistance of the lamented Dom Bäumer, whose name is a sufficient guarantee of the solidity of any work in which he was engaged. Of course, in books of this kind, there are always epochs and details which have been studied with less interest and accuracy than the rest. Here, at it appears to us, it is the earlier part of the volume that has received least attention; for instance, we have not met with any mention of the accounts of daily prayer in the Acts, or in the Didache. On the other hand, the accounts of the attempts to reform the Breviary under the direction of the Council of Trent, and of Benedict XIV., leave nothing to be desired in their clear and full statement of a very intricate subject. M. Batiffol's literary taste is fully shown by the judicious remarks he makes on the "reform" of the hymns under Urban VIII., and in his appreciation of the beauty of many of the responsories at Matins, which, we believe, Mr. Matthew Arnold said were the best explanation of the Bible.

The Inner Life of Père Lacordaire. Translated by the Author of "Knight of St. John." Seventh Edition. 6s. 6d. Washbourne. 1895.—The fact of Père Chocarne's "Vie Intime et Religieuse de Lacordaire" reaching a seventh edition in its English dress proves two things. The original work must be one of merit, and the translation must be very different from what commonly passes for such. No

one who has read Père Chocarne's delightful pages will wonder at the extraordinary success the "Vie Intime" has obtained in France and elsewhere, nor will any of those who still lament the loss which English letters sustained by the death of Mother Theodosia Drane be surprised at the popularity which her spirited translation still enjoys. Hers is a noble rendering of a noble life. The publishers have brought out the book in a handy form, on good paper, and at a price which no admirer of the Dominican spirit will think unreasonable.

G. H.

An English Manor House in the Days of Queen Elizabeth. By J. R. WILLINGTON, M.A. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company. 1895.—The inseparable closeness with which memorials of Catholic faith are intertwined with the traditions of English life is illustrated in this interesting little monograph. Lyford Grange in Berkshire, about eight miles from Abington, is the manor house that forms the setting of its story, and serves as an introduction to the sketch of the martyred Edmund Campion, with whose fate it is associated. There it was, that after preaching and ministering for the last time to the little congregation assembled in secret to hear him, he was taken by a spy of the Earl of Leicester, and hurried to the Tower to endure tortures and eventually death on the scaffold, on December 1, 1581. The blood of the martyr bore immediate fruit, for a drop of it having fallen on the clothes of a youth named Henry Walpole, he was converted on the spot, and becoming in his turn a Jesuit, soon after "met the same fate on the same spot, for the same cause."

A Book of Irish Verse. Selected by W. B. YEATS. London: Methuen. 1895.—The author's admirable prefatory essay proves him to be qualified for his task of selection by the possession of a standard of personal preference, which, if not infallible, is at least spontaneous. He has compiled a very interesting volume, containing specimens of some of the best known Irish poets as to the inclusion of whose works, and the exclusion of others that might have seemed entitled to a place, he claims to have been guided by personal predilections alone.

Little Merry Face. By CLARA MULHOLLAND. London: Burns & Oates.—Miss Mulholland's collection of short tales will we doubt not be a treasure in many nurseries where her name is already a "household word." They will serve a double purpose by helping to awaken sympathy in the minds of happy little ones for the poor and

[No. 15 of *Fourth Series*.]

Q

outcast children whose lines have fallen in less pleasant places. It is of the fortunes and endurance of such as these that they mostly tell, with a grace of narration that makes them interesting reading for an older public than that they are immediately intended for. Many of them are full of quiet pathos, and all breathe a spirit of true Catholic piety, which conveys the highest moral without obtruding it.

The Story of the Expansion of Southern Africa. By the Hon. A. WILMOT. London: Fisher Unwin. 1894.—So many eyes are now turned on the long neglected Cape Colony, that a history of its rise and progress, well arranged and clearly told like that before us, cannot but be welcome to the public. Comprised in a handy volume with an excellent map brought up to date by the addition of the latest railway extensions, it furnishes all the information the general reader requires as to the early fortunes of that South African dominion which promises to be so valuable an appanage of the British Empire. Nor is the compendious narrative of recent events in its later chapters less useful, although its main features are more present to our minds. The account of aboriginal chiefs and races, too, is interesting, though the author writes as a strong partisan from the colonial point of view, on the native question, and seems also an advocate of Boer independence. He predicts that the Karoo plateau, hitherto comparatively neglected, “will yet become one of the greatest treasures of the Cape Colony,” as it only requires irrigation by tapping its underground supplies of water to develop the capabilities of its fertile soil, while its dry, pure, and health-giving air renders it a suitable region for European colonisation.

Books Received.

- De Libris Prohibitis.** Rev. Augustine Arnt, S.J. 8vo, pp. 315.
- Sacra Liturgia.** J. F. Van der Stappen. Malines : H. Dessam. 8vo, pp. 332.
- Socialism.** Lord Norton. London : Percival & Co. 8vo, pp. 35.
- Œuvres Poétiques d'Adam de S. Victor.** Texte Critique. Paris : Alphonse Picard & Fils. 8vo. pp. 332.
- Napoleon III. avant l'Empire.** Tom. I. H. Thirria. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie. Large 8vo, pp. 482.
- Memoires du Chevalier de Mautort.** La Baron Tillette de Clemont-Tonnerre. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 8vo, pp. 504.
- Charity is the Greatest Created Gift of God.** Very Rev. J. A. Malthus, O.P. London : Burns & Oates. 16mo, pp. 40.
- Synopsis Tractatus Scholastici de Deo Uno.** R. P. Ferdinand A. Stentrup, S.J. Innsbruck. F. Rauch. 8vo, pp. 368.
- Les Benedictins de Saint-Germain-des-Près et les Savans Lyonnais.** M. l'Abbé Jean Vanel. Paris : Alphonse Picard et Fils. Large 8vo, pp. 372.
- Une Ancienne Version de l'Ecclésiastique.** C. Douais. Paris : Alphonse Picard. 4mo, pp. 32.
- Italy and her Invaders.** T. Hodgkin. Vols. V. & VI. Clarendon Press. 8vo, pp. 484, 634.
- Allemagne et la Reforme.** Jean Janssens. Traduit par E. Paris. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie. Large 8vo, pp. 540.
- St. Chantal and the Origin of the Visitation.** Mgr. Bougaud. Bishop of Laval. Translated by a Visitandine. Preface by H.E. Cardinal Gibbons. New York : Benziger Bros. Vol. I. & II. 8vo, pp. 478-460.
- The World's own Book in the Treasury of à Kempis.** Percy Fitzgerald, M.A. London : Elliot Stock. 8vo, pp. 100.

Meditations sur Jésus Christ. Par l'Abbé A. Blanc. (2^{ème} édition.)
Avignon : Aubanel Frères. 8vo, pp. 452.

Philosophie de Saint Thomas. La Connaissance. Par M. J. Gardair, Professor libre de la Philosophie. Paris : P. Lethielloux. 8vo, pp. 298.

Memoir of Mother Francis Raphaël (Augusta Theodore Drane). Rev. Father Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 8vo, pp. 334.

La Domination Française en Belgique. Par L. de Lanzac de Laborie. Tom. I. & II. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie. Large 8vo, pp. 464, 408.

Mémoires du Comte Paroy. Par Étienne Charavay. Paris : Plon, Nourrit et Cie. Large 8vo, pp. 478.

Ethics or Anarchy. Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 100.

Laurence Oliphant. Supplementary contributions to his Biography. By Charles Newton Scott. London : Leadenhall Press. Pp. 42.

Stenotypy, or Shorthand for the Typewriter. By Rev. D. A. Quin. Providence, R.J. Pp. 54.

Ancient Devotions to the Sacred Heart. By Carthusian Monks. London : Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. 318.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1895.

ART. I.—HALLUCINATIONS.

GHOSTS and uncanny things attract attention with perennial fascination, and create an itching to probe the mystery of their nature and meaning. Science, in vindication of the supremacy of matter, has battled strongly and fiercely against spectres and superstitions, but as quickly as one head is severed the hydra at once presents another. No sooner were witches and fairies, wraiths and pixies demolished, than mesmerism and clairvoyance started up to be in due course shorn of their supernatural pretensions, but only to be replaced by table-turning and mediums. The survivals now comprise projections, astral bodies, and mahatmas. The recurrence of these crazes discloses the irrepressible craving in the soul for the unseen, for something beyond the limits of its own nature. In a Catholic this innate longing is gratified by frequent communion with spirits. With him the dead are not extinct, nor excluded from the range of thought and presence: he speaks with a sense of nearness to saints and angels, he is the instrument of bounty in the realm of purgatory. Spirits and spirit life have for him a homeliness and a familiarity that lessen surprise and deaden curiosity. Those with less faith display more credulity and greater perplexity. They ask, and with some trepidation, what truth underlies the stories of ghosts and appearances, the evidence for which has been well sifted and the facts seemingly placed beyond question. Are they phantasms and hallucinations, mere

[No. 16 of *Fourth Series*.]

R

figments of the brain, or have they existence external to the spectator? How can a friend hundreds of miles away appear at the moment of his otherwise unknown death? The facts are verified and authenticated: is the phenomenon capable of a natural explanation?

To throw light on these questions the Society for Psychical Research sprang up some years back. The accounts of ghosts and apparitions, usually second-hand narratives, were as vague and indefinite as the appearances themselves. The members of the Society undertook to thoroughly examine each case, to take evidence at first-hand, to secure written statements, to sift and verify the assertions, and to obtain any possible corroboration. They then met and discussed the case, offered suggestions and explanations, raised difficulties or objections, or arranged for further inquiry. Isolated instances here and there, however well authenticated, could lead to few general inferences, and they early perceived the advantage of a large number of cases where they might collate common features and apply the ordinary laws of induction. A committee was consequently appointed to organise what they termed a census of hallucinations, by which they hoped to accumulate a sufficient number of instances, and also to ascertain the prevalence of these experiences. They enlisted an army of 410 reliable collectors. Each one received instructions to interview twenty-five persons over twenty-one years of age, taken haphazard, and furnish written answers to this question: "Have you ever, when believing yourself to be completely awake, had a vivid impression of seeing or being touched by a living being or inanimate object, or of hearing a voice, which impression, so far as you can discover, was not due to any external physical cause?" To secure an impartial and reliable return, the collectors were enjoined not to put the question to any whom they otherwise knew to have had these experiences, to take the direct evidence of the person himself, and to exclude those who had been at any time subject to insanity or delirium. The respondents in the affirmative were supplied with a schedule on which to furnish particulars. These returns were examined by the committee, further details or explanations requested, in many cases a member of the committee had a personal interview, and all possible documents

and corroborations were obtained. Nine-tenths of the collectors had received an education up to the standard of professional classes, and the informants were mainly their friends and acquaintances of similar standing. The collection commenced in April 1889 and continued till May 1892, thus extending over three years, and the Report (400 pp.) appears in the Society's proceedings for August 1894. The number of persons interrogated was 17,000, of whom no less than 2272 answered the census question in the affirmative.

Before examining the Report and its inferences, some preamble is desirable. The Catholic position is clear about supernatural experiences. No Catholic can doubt that Almighty God permits the appearance of spirits to mortals. The testimony of Holy Scripture alone is decisive, and amongst the many instances recorded in the sacred text the most conspicuous, perhaps, is the mission of the Archangel Raphael, who accompanied the younger Tobias through a long journey in the guise of a man, was seen by many, and only disclosed his identity at the termination of his charge. Throughout the history of the Church the lives of the saints, the chronicles, the records of every age and clime, testify to the frequency of spiritual manifestations. A Catholic may have misgivings about this apparition or the other, but entertains no doubt of their possibility and constant recurrence: his difficulty consists in determining which are supernatural and which are illusions. If they are supernatural, reverence deters him from scrutinising too closely the method in which the manifestation is recognised, for granting a divine interposition God may employ whatever ways He chooses. This does not prevent a Catholic from adopting means to ascertain the supernatural character of an occurrence, or from investigating whether an apparition might be produced by natural causes alone. Should the apparition of a saint be explained by natural operations, God may use, as He frequently does, this natural cause, in the same way as He may restore health either by manifest miracle, or by giving efficacy to ordinary medicine in answer to prayer. The absence of adequate motive for Divine interposition is a striking feature in the census of hallucinations, and helps the tendency to seek for explanation in natural laws known or unknown. The term supernatural in its current sense excludes

the unknown natural, hence the term *supernormal* more aptly expresses the conditions in question: the figure of an angel in the room may be the subjective creation of the brain, or it may be an objective image permitted by God: the term *supernormal* includes both suppositions.

The precise meaning assigned to terms in the Report needs some explanation. *Dream images* are the common stock of all. While the exercise of will, judgment and consciousness are suspended, some mechanism in the brain conjures up apparitions without limit, often a regular drama, at times violent or grotesque in action, and always inducing for the moment a conviction of reality. In the waking state each one has a greater or less facility of forming *mental images*—e.g., the diagram of a problem in geometry, or the figures of a sum in mental arithmetic may be fairly pictured by many, and adepts will reproduce faces and scenes. These mental images are drawn within the brain, and during their persistence the attention is abstracted from external objects. A mental image which the mind believes to be *external* and to have relations to surrounding objects is called a *hallucination*. An external mental image with surroundings that do not belong to the surroundings of the spectator is classed as a *vision*. The presentment of real objects in such form, as to induce the mind to believe them to be something else is an *illusion*. The distinctions will be the better understood from examples.

As I descended the stairs to breakfast, I saw Mary (the servant) approaching me from the basement door, dressed, as usual when on an errand, in her brown straw hat, black cloth jacket, and light print frock; and I had only just time to reach the kitchen door to permit her *to pass behind me*, without stopping, on her way to the scullery. The instant I entered the kitchen I observed to my wife, "So Mary has had to go for milk again." "No," she replied, "she has not." "But," I exclaimed, "I have just seen her, dressed, come from the front door; and besides, I heard the door banged as she went out." "It is your fancy," she returned, "Mary has not been out this morning, and she is now in the breakfast-room at work." There was no doubt that such was the case (Report, p. 73).

The image of the servant is here believed to be external, and is seen in connection with the surrounding doors and passages, and the instance is a hallucination.

"I was in my room (I was then residing in the North of England, quite 100 miles away from Miss Morton's home), preparing for bed, between twelve and half-past, when I seemed suddenly to be standing close to the housemaid's cupboard, facing the short flight of stairs leading to the top landing. Coming down these stairs, I saw the figure, exactly as described, and about two steps behind Miss Morton herself, with a dressing-gown thrown loosely round her, and carrying a candle in her hand. A loud voice in the room overhead recalled me to my surroundings, and although I tried for some time I could not resume the impression (p. 85).

Here the images are separated from the surroundings of the spectator and the experience is classed as a vision.

Lying in bed, facing the window, and opening my eyes voluntarily in order to drive away the imagery of an unpleasant dream which was beginning to revive, I saw the figure of a man, some three or four feet distant from my head, standing perfectly still by the bedstead, so close to it that the bedclothes seemed slightly pushed towards me by his leg pressing against them. The image was perfectly distinct—height about five feet eight inches, sallow complexion, grey eyes, greyish moustache, short and bristly, and apparently recently clipped. His dress seemed like a dark-grey dressing-gown, tied with a dark-red rope. My first thought was, "That's a ghost;" my second, "It may be a burglar whose designs upon my watch are interrupted by my opening my eyes." I bent forwards towards him, and the image vanished. As the image vanished, my attention passed to a shadow on the wall, twice or three times the distance off, and perhaps twelve feet high. There was a gas lamp in the mews-lane outside, which shed a light through the lower twelve inches or so of the (first floor) window, over which the blind had not been completely drawn, and the shadow was cast by the curtain hanging beside the window. The solitary bit of colour in the image—the red rope of the dressing-gown—was immediately afterwards identified with the twisted mahogany handle of the dressing-table, which was in the same line of vision as part of the shadow" (p. 94).

That is an illusion.

Hallucinations that involve merely the image and the spectator are termed *simple* hallucinations, but some are susceptible of corroboration from an external person or circumstance. They may coincide in time with an event—*e.g.*, a death, that happens elsewhere, or they may convey some knowledge hitherto unknown, or they may be collective—*i.e.*, occur simultaneously to two or more persons. These are called *veridical* by the Report, for the external relations can be

verified. They have a greater interest and an importance than simple hallucinations, for they imply an explanation not only of the genesis of the phantasm, but also of its connection with the verified event or person at a distance. The following is an example:

It occurred at Bury (Lancashire), about fourteen years ago; I was awakened by a rattling noise at the window, and wakened my step-brother, with whom I was sleeping, and asked him if he could hear it. He told me to go to sleep, there was nothing. The rattle came again in a few minutes, and I sat up in bed, and distinctly saw the image of one of my step-brothers (who at the time was in Blackpool) pass from the window towards the door. Time 2.30 A.M. I was in good health and spirits. Age eighteen. I had not seen him for some time. He had not been home for two or three months. We heard next morning that he had been taken ill and died about 2.30 A.M. Three step-brothers and myself slept in the same room. I awakened them, but they could not see anything. My father, hearing the talking, got out of bed, and came into the room. I told him what I had seen, and he got his watch, and said, "We will see if we hear anything of him" (p. 227).

In the results of the census the large proportion of persons who have experienced some form of hallucination first arrests attention. The committee, however, considerably reduce the 2272 affirmative answers. After examination of the narratives they exclude many that are not strictly hallucinations—*e.g.*, illusions, dream images, images occurring immediately after sleep that were probably the remains of the dream, mental pictures with the eyes shut, vague or indistinct sounds, and other experiences pronounced doubtful. In this way they have transferred 588 cases, a quarter of the whole, from the ayes to the noes. This leaves 1684 out of 17,000 persons, or roughly one in ten, who believe that they have seen, heard, or felt something supernormal. This large number suggests deception, and the Report discusses minutely the sources of error. Intentional deception, refusals to answer, the bias of collectors have, it concludes, no appreciable effect on the numbers, for they influence about equally both ayes and noes. Lapse of memory seriously affects the number of ayes:

We estimate that, in order to arrive at the true number of visual hallucinations experienced by our informants since the age of 10, the reported number must be multiplied by some number between 4 and $6\frac{1}{2}$,

and that in the case of auditory and tactile hallucinations, a still larger correction would be needful (p. 69).

The tendency of errors would rather increase the proportion of ayes. The result is at least startling, but the greater the prevalence of these experiences the more likely are they to be traced to natural causes.

The 1684 cases, in as far as they are reliable, furnish a goodly number, indeed the largest on record, for comparison and analysis. The more numerous the instances the more correct will be the inferences in the inductive process. Although the experiences recorded in the census are sufficiently numerous to justify inferences, allowance must be made for the unscientific character of the evidence and the vague and indefinite nature of the whole inquiry. They become tendencies rather than scientific inferences. Taking the senses affected, 62 per cent. of the reported experiences were recognised by the sense of sight, 28 per cent. by hearing, and 10 per cent. by touch. Of the 494 hallucinations of hearing, 84 consisted of mere indistinct voices, in 233 the hearer's name only was pronounced, and in 177 a sentence or more was heard. Of the 179 tactile cases in only six did the percipient touch the hallucinatory object. Thus the visual instances are the more important and the more reliable, for hearing and touch are more susceptible to deception; sounds, especially at night, are liable to misinterpretation.

The form that visual hallucinations assume and the accessories accompanying the experience are interesting and suggestive. Of 1112 experiences perceptible by sight, 830 took the human form—viz., 352 of living persons, 163 of dead persons, and 315 unrecognised. The proportion of living to dead phantasms disposes of the traditional connection between ghosts and the departed. The living are more frequently in the mind, and the proportion tends to favour the supposition that apparitions are subjective creations of the brain. In dream images the figures of the living predominate. The form of the appearances will be best described by the Report itself:

One of the facts brought out most strongly by our tables is the tendency of hallucinations to assume familiar forms. The ghastly or horrible apparitions dear to writers of romance seem to be very rare

among healthy grown-up people—at least, among those who are educated. The great majority of hallucinations are like the sights we are accustomed to see, or the sounds we are accustomed to hear, and even when they are not so, they often suggest, as we shall see, a sort of incompleteness in a hallucination of a natural object, rather than a hallucination representing something unnatural. In the exceptional cases where the hallucination does represent a non-natural being, we find it assuming the conventional form. An angel, for instance, takes the form with which art has familiarised us, and we should be surprised to find one appearing to a grown-up person arrayed in “blue boots,” like those seen by Mrs. D. when a child.

Most visual hallucinations represent human beings, and most of these represent human beings of the present day in all respects. According to our statistics more than two-fifths of the realistic human apparitions represent living persons known to the percipient, and, of these, 45 per cent. represent inmates of the same house as the percipient, or persons frequently, or (in a few cases) very recently, seen by him, while in another 20 per cent. they represent near relations of his—that is, parents, grandparents, children, husbands, wives, brothers or sisters. In the great majority of realistic cases the apparition represents a single figure only, though there are exceptions.

As far as the reports as to dress enable us to judge, phantoms, both recognised and unrecognised, generally appear in ordinary modern dress, and do not affect old-fashioned costumes any more than real people do. When they move, which, as we have said, happens more often than not, the movement is almost always such as we are accustomed to see. The phantom stands on the ground and appears to walk along the ground, and seems to leave the field of vision as a human being would, by walking out of an open door or passing behind some obstacle. A position impossible for real persons—such as being up in the air—when the figure is otherwise realistic, is very rare. We have only one instance of it. The proverbial gliding movement, supposed to be characteristic of apparitions, is rarely reported. Appearance or disappearance by an unrealistic means is also rare, though there are about a dozen cases in our collection in which the ghost seems to enter or leave a room through a wall, book-case, closed door, or window, or by passing up through the ceiling or down through the floor.

Even when a phantom is stationary, it does not usually either appear suddenly out of empty space, or similarly vanish before the percipient's eyes, but is generally seen by the percipient on turning his eyes that way, and vanishes, he does not know how, or when he is looking away. There are, however, instances of sudden appearance and disappearance in free space (p. 113).

The Report separates a class of 143 cases, which it calls “incompletely developed apparitions.” Although these are not full-grown ghosts they have an interest, for they admit us

into the factory of hallucinations. Here we have transparent and filmy figures with nebulous substance, shapely enough for an idea, but without outline or features sufficient for an object of real vision. Figures draped hazily or shrouded cross the field of vision without exposing enough to identify them, or a partly finished image comes within sight with outline complete, but with details blurred or indistinct. The following are specimens: "I saw the figure of a man which was perfectly transparent, and which came into the room and sat down by my side" (p. 109). "There would be a sort of movement in the air, which gradually took the form of mist, and then developed into a dark-veiled figure, which came nearer to me, and when bending over and about to touch me I threw my hands into it and it vanished" (p. 120). "I distinctly saw—first a filmy cloud which rose up at the other end of the room, then the head and shoulders of a man, middle-aged, stout, with iron-grey hair and blue eyes" (p. 116). Instances are reported of the appearance of a part only of the human figure, the head of a skeleton develops into the head and features of a mother, faces come out of the wall, "two black legs walking towards us, and ending abruptly." These undeveloped apparitions have a semblance to our dream images, and they seem to furnish a link in the chain of evidence to connect the sleeping with the waking dream.

The number and variety of the cases in the census suggest inquiry into what influences or promotes hallucinations. The informants who sent affirmative answers to the census question were in the proportion of two men to three women. Whatever mental or nervous differences exist in the physiology of the female would seem to favour hallucinations. This corresponds with Mr. F. Galton's assertion in his "Inquiries into Human Faculty," that women have greater power of visualising than men. Men apparently forget their hallucinations sooner, for on examining the influence of forgetfulness the Report discovers that the longer the interval of time since the occurrence of the experience, the larger becomes the proportion of women who have been subject to hallucinations. The more impressionable female nature retains longer the memory of such experiences. Difference of age has little effect, old and young see spectres indiscriminately, except that the propor-

tion is slightly higher between the ages of twenty and thirty. In young children the frequency of hallucinations is difficult to ascertain, for their powers of memory and observation are defective. That they have hallucinations is undoubted, and some think that they are specially liable to them. An instance of a child under two years of age who saw an apparition of a person recently dead, is recorded in the *Annales Psychiques* (January 1894, p. 7). The representation of grotesque and fanciful images is a feature in the hallucinations of children. A child's judgment is immature and its stock of knowledge limited, and it is more likely to see distorted or quaint images. In dreams and delirium where judgment is in abeyance, grotesque images appear to adults, another point in the analogy between dream images and these hallucinations.

The statistics of the census slightly favour heredity as influencing hallucinations. No special question was put about relationship, but accidental references in the narratives intimate that in no less than eighty-five families two or more have had supernormal experiences. "In one family, two sisters, a father, grandfather, two uncles and two aunts were all subject to visual hallucinations" (p. 154). In the 129 collective hallucinations—*i.e.*, seen or heard by more than one person, half were experienced by blood relations. The fact of living together only partially accounts for this, since the hallucinations seen by both husband and wife, more frequently in company, are only 10 per cent. In confirmation of the census cases every one has read of ancestral ghosts who are seen only by the family, as also of warnings and appearances at the death of a member of the family. How far these experiences are really attributable to heredity may be open to question; it seems more likely that family tradition renders the form familiar, and induces any hallucinatory tendency to assume it.

We might anticipate that ill-health would prove a fruitful source of hallucinations. A physique weakened by disease or languid through lassitude might be expected to leave the imagination open to spectres and visions, and popular scepticism attributes ghosts to the machinations of dyspepsia and other ailments. The census tends to shatter the current notion that spectres are dependent on a low condition of bodily health. Insanity and delirium were excluded by the collectors, hence,

with the exception of febrile hallucinations, the answers of the informants would include any other illness. The schedule submitted to the affirmative informants contained the question: "Were you out of health?" About 44 per cent. asserted positively that they were in good health at the time of the experience, and 48 per cent. passed the question by without reply. The omission to answer is assumed by the Report to indicate that the informant was in health. It is often clearly inferred in the actual narrative, the tendency is to exaggerate rather than to overlook the connection between the hallucination and ill-health, and the terms of the question might imply that an answer was not required unless out of health. Only 123 cases, or about 7 per cent. report a certain degree of ill-health. In twenty-one the patient was convalescent, and in the remainder describes himself as "in a nervous dyspeptic condition," "in a very low state of health," "bronchitis with weakness of heart," "a little below par and somewhat nervous and excited." So that the bulk of the informants seem to have the full possession of their faculties, and to be in a normal condition of health with no symptoms of disease, except the hallucination itself be regarded as such. Those who are conversant with the phenomena of hypnotism do not admit the hallucinatory tendency to be a disease.

It may be suggested that hallucinations happen to persons who are constitutionally subject to them, and may be traced to something amiss in the mental gear. The Report disposes of this by a table which shows that only a third of the informants have experienced more than one hallucination, and that two-thirds state definitely that they have had one and one only. This favours the supposition that hallucinations do not imply a morbid physical condition. The frequency with which hallucinations occur to those who have experienced more than one varies in this proportion; about one-half "several or many," a third two only, and the remainder from three to six. With some the experiences have been miscellaneous, but with more than half the same experience has recurred with slight variations. In the recurrence of the same hallucination the auditory and tactile show a higher proportion than the visual, which the Report attributes to the smaller variety of form in auditory and tactile cases.

From the influence of the physical condition of the body the Report passes to the effect of mental and nervous states, which apparently have a closer connection with hallucinatory tendency—*e.g.*, overwork, anxiety, grief and emotional conditions. In twenty-five cases the apparition is directly attributed to over-strain of the mind, which is also partially responsible in seventeen others. The following curious incident illustrates the vagaries of over-pressure :

I saw what seemed to be the end of a ladder placed against the lower part of my bedroom window. Slowly the head and shoulders of a man (ordinary workman's dress) appear until he is high enough to unfasten the window catch, an operation he immediately proceeds to try to perform. Place: my rooms at Oxford. Time: always between 12 and 2 A.M. Dates: I do not remember, but at least twice respectively in the winters 1884-5, 1885-6, 1886-7, 1887-8, never since. I was lying sleepless and worried in bed, but in perfect health in other ways, the "worry" due entirely to overwork. Age 24-29. The man was a perfect stranger; actions suggestive simply of burglary. (N.B.—I have never been in any house which has been burglariously entered.) The experiences were always exactly the same. I always regarded it as my sign that I was overworking. As soon as I could rest the hallucination disappeared ; if I couldn't rest immediately, it appeared nightly (p. 166).

The influence of grief or anxiety in producing hallucinations is difficult to determine. In one-twelfth of the reported cases mental distress accompanies the supernormal experience, either anxiety concerning the illness or absence of a friend, or grief attending the announcement of death. An analysis of the instances of death news casts a doubt whether the knowledge of the death prompted the hallucination, or the hallucination itself caused the mental disturbance. In cases of anxiety about illness the experience usually occurred during the period of attendance at the bedside of the patient, and may be due to want of sleep or other causes. Altogether, the Report declines to draw any conclusion about grief and anxiety. In certain cases the mental distress evidently created the hallucination of which the following is an example :

When going from Glasgow to New York per Anchor steamer *Europa* on March 4th, 1871, we were overtaken by a severe storm, which somewhat alarmed all the passengers. At 10 o'clock P.M. we were startled by the news that the bridge had been swept away, carrying with it the captain and two principal officers, who were lost. In the excitement the

vessel fell off into the trough of the sea, which increased our fears. We were all gathered together in the cabin, the doctor reading from the Prayer Book, as we thought our last hours were come. While sitting lonely and sad, thinking of my loved ones at home, I lifted my head to look across the cabin, and saw, as I thought, my mother standing with my little boy waiting for me at the sea shore. I saw them very distinctly, just as I had seen them moving about before they died. My mother had died about a year before this, and my boy about six months. Coming to me in this hour of deep grief, it gave me a thrill of real joy. The vision only lasted for a few moments. I was then forty-four years old. About twenty were in the cabin, but no one shared the experience; it was personal to myself (p. 169.)

A more important condition in the structure of hallucinations consists in a state of mental repose, and in circumstances favourable to abstraction or vacancy of mind. It is certainly striking that 38 per cent. of the visual, 34 per cent. of the auditory, and 44 per cent. of the tactile cases occurred when the percipient was in bed, or had been asleep in a chair or couch. In every instance the informant states that he was fully awake, and taking into account how small a fraction of a life is passed awake in bed, the large proportion of hallucinations during that interval is most suggestive. The informant was doubtless in some instances deceived himself about his wakefulness, but in 671 recorded cases of experiences whilst in bed there is strong presumption that a state of repose is favourable to hallucinations. The Report suggests that the mental condition before and after sleep is somewhat similar to the hypnotic state where hallucinations are easily induced. Personal experience testifies to the unique condition of our minds in the intervals of wakefulness in bed, either expecting or trying to woo sleep, or reluctant on awakening to be satisfied that sleep is really ended. This mental state does not recur at other times, it is a borderland between wakeful activity and the oblivion of sleep. In this twilight recent statistics suggest that spirits are mainly wont to walk. We all also experience that dream images sometimes persist after sleep has gone, and occasionally recur spontaneously to the memory during the day; a forgetfulness of the dream and the perception in awakened consciousness of the recurring dream image would create a ghost. The tendency of supernormal experiences to take place whilst in bed supports the analogy between

hallucinations and dream images. The same conditions of silence, recumbent position, quiescent mind, and absence of control of the will promote hallucinations and always accompany dreams. Supposing a common origin, the alertness of judgment and consciousness would account for the precision and definiteness of the hallucinations in contrast with the grotesqueness and instability of the dream image. In confirmation of the inferences from "clinical" cases the statistics furnish evidence of the influence of solitude on supernormal experiences. Of the 1112 instances of visual hallucinations no less than 692 (including clinical cases), or 62 per cent., occurred when the spectator was alone or practically alone, while only 308 took place in the presence of others; in the remainder the circumstance is not mentioned.

Expectancy strongly wrought up will prepare the way for hallucinations if it does not actually create them. The fancied presence of a burglar in the house and intentness in listening will often conjure up sounds. Fourteen cases are recorded of the appearance of the phantasm of a friend whose arrival was expected, of which the following is an instance :

This happened in 1870 when Mrs. E. was aged forty. She was sitting in the drawing-room of an hotel overlooking a park, and was waiting for her husband to take her down to dinner. The drawing-room door was open, and from her seat Mrs. E. had a view of part of the staircase and the intervening hall or passage. He delayed coming, so Mrs. E. ever and anon kept glancing towards the door and out into the hall beyond. At last one time she thought she saw him turn a bend in the staircase and come slowly along the corridor. Keeping her eyes fixed all the time on what she thought was her husband approaching her with a well-known smile, Mrs. E. rose and crossed the room till she stood, as she thought, opposite her husband, when the spectre vanished from before her eyes. She was in good health at this time. In about half an hour afterwards, her husband, detained unavoidably, did veritably come into the room (p. 174).

The prominence given to suggestion in hypnotic experiments marks it as a possible source of hallucinations. A person gazing at the stars soon gathers a crowd round him, a fair proportion of which before it disperses will have seen an imaginary comet and described the shape and length of its tail. The process in supernormal experiences may not be so pronounced, but the probability of their production by sugges-

tion becomes of importance in considering collective hallucinations where several share the same experience. With a predisposition to hallucinations a slight circumstance may act as a suggestion. The following instance will be due, partly at least, to suggestion :

In the year 1883 I was studying music, and used to practise alone frequently in the evening. Towards the autumn of that year, on one occasion I felt some one touch me, and on looking round I saw the figure of a gentleman whom I knew. He was dressed in black clothes, with the collar of his coat buttoned closely round his neck, showing no white collar. As I looked he faded away. This occurred on three different occasions. I was in perfect health at the time, and in no trouble or anxiety; of full age. I had not seen the gentleman himself for about two years before that occurrence, and have no idea what he was doing at the time. The two first occasions were exactly alike. On the last occasion a young girl was playing a duet with me. She suddenly shuddered and said, "I felt some one touch me." I also felt as if a hand touched my shoulder, and on looking round saw the same gentleman (p. 177).

The imaginary touch evidently suggested the presence of some one, and the image of the particular acquaintance may arise from association of ideas in the past. The second experience is probably suggested by the first, and the third seems certainly induced by the verbal suggestion of the friend. Sounds may easily suggest a visual hallucination; a noise in the room at night not unfrequently suggests a burglar, and a vivid imagination will see him creep from under the bed. An instance occurs in the "Phantasms of the Living":

Between sleeping and waking this morning, I fancied a dog running about in a field (an ideal white-and-tan sporting dog). The next moment I heard a dog barking outside the window. Keeping my closed eyes on the vision, I found it came and went with the barking of the dog outside, getting fainter, however, each time (vol. i. p. 474, footnote).

Although this ranks rather as a dream persistence than a complete hallucination, it illustrates how readily the brain supplements in one sense the suggestion of another. In hallucinations affecting two senses it is often uncertain whether the first is hallucinatory or real. The sound or the touch usually precedes, and when the attention is caught the visual hallucination follows. The sound may be real but misinterpreted, and the

illusion thus formed suggests the phantasm that succeeds. Sounds are unduly credited with a supernormal character because they are unexplained rather than inexplicable. The fact of assigning an imaginary result to a real sound may itself dispose the visual organs or the brain to supply an unreal vision. The influence of suggestion in originating hallucinations is mainly a matter of conjecture and necessarily attended by doubt.

The working of suggestion is more interesting in the accessories that accompany hallucinations, or contribute to their formation, one thing leading on to another. In fourteen cases mention is made of the opening and shutting of a door. If the door is really opened by some physical cause—*e.g.*, a draught, the fact would suggest the entrance of some one, but in most cases the door is found in the same position before and after the hallucination. The movement of the apparition towards the door for departure suggests the opening and shutting of the door as part of the hallucination, and even the bang of the door may be so explained. It is remarkable that in upwards of 1600 cases no evidence worth considering is alleged of any subsequent change or modification in external surrounding objects, the apparition does not meddle with material things. Some curious effects are worthy of notice. In four instances the reflection of the apparition was seen in a mirror, and in one the reflection was seen first. Here suggestion may apply: the sight of an image in the mirror obviously supposes a figure to cast it, and *vice versa* if the eyes in passing from the figure rest on the mirror, its presence suggests a reflection. A similar explanation may account for two cases in which the apparition casts a shadow. An example will illustrate the operation of suggestion:

My cousin, Miss S., somewhat older than I, and myself had been conversing in the parlour. She left me. The house door opening into the parlour stood open, the night being warm, and the moonlight streamed in over the floor beside me as I sat, leaning on the sofa-arm, my back to the entrance. The shadow of a human form fell on the moonlit floor. Half turning my head I saw a tall woman dressed in white, her back to me. By the contour and gleam of the plaits round her head I recognised my cousin, and deemed she had doffed her black dress to try a white one. I addressed an ordinary remark to her. She did not reply, and I turned right round upon her. She then went out of the door down the entrance

steps, and as she disappeared I wondered I had heard nothing of a step or the rustle of her dress. I sat and puzzled over this, though without taking fright, for a few minutes. I was unoccupied, ruminating quietly; in robust health, completely awake, untroubled; age, sixteen years about. It was, I felt convinced, though I did not see her face, my cousin (p. 187).

One informant says: "I watched the figure walk right round the room, passing between myself and the candle on the dressing-table (for a moment it hid the light from me), until it reached the hearthrug, when it disappeared" (p. 188). Again, another states: "A finger placed between the eye and the image intercepted it in the same way as it would any ordinary object; in short, the phenomenon obeyed all the optical laws of vision" (p. 141). These two instances raise the question of the relation of a phantasm to the objects behind and before it in the line of sight. In one case an image without substance conceals material objects, in the other intervening objects obscure images which presumably are seated in the brain. In the first the attention is so fixed on the image that the mind is abstracted from the objects on the other side, adverting to them only when the figure directs attention to them, and when a circumstance—*e.g.*, the candle above—does call attention to their presence, the conviction of the reality of the figure unconsciously suggests that it should behave as if real, and hence obstruct the light on passing before the candle. Again, the conviction of the reality of the spectre leads to the expectation that it should be wholly or partially invisible when it passes behind a screen or piece of furniture. Thus the concealment of a chair or other article by the image, or the hiding of a part of the image by an obstacle becomes part of the hallucination through suggestion. The instance recording that objects were seen through the image is explained by imperfect "externalisation"; the more active the imagination the more opaque and substantial does the image appear, as the imaginative power weakens the figure becomes hazy, indistinct, and unsubstantial. Where the reports mention that the eyes were closed the hallucination usually vanishes, and sometimes it reappears on opening the eyes. The fact of closing the eyes is an effort to withdraw the attention, and hence becomes a suggestion not to see the image, while opening them again is in expectation of seeing

it. So also a hallucination "does not usually follow the movement of the eyes, but can be looked away from and back to, like a real object." Here the fact of voluntarily turning the eyes away has the same effect as closing them, and is a suggestion no longer to see the image. In hallucinations affecting more than one sense, and in subsequent hallucinations of the same sense, the scope for suggestion is obvious. In the flurry and excitement of a supernormal experience details escape notice, and we are reduced to piecing together inferences from casual observations. A cool, calm survey of the phenomena of an apparition would provide matter for many inferences, but from the nature of a hallucination a too philosophical attitude would dispel the image.

In the recorded cases of simple hallucinations, containing no fact to be verified externally, nothing occurs in the narratives to hinder a subjective explanation showing them to be mere creations of the brain. The forms which they assume are familiar to the brain, and even when grotesque or only partially developed, are such that would be considered normal in dreams. The circumstances that tend to favour or produce them—heredity, overwork, ill-health, anxiety, grief, repose, expectancy, or suggestion, either singly or in combination, all indicate a subjective origin. That they are subjective cannot be positively asserted, but the evidence tends that way. Supposing their origin to be natural, what is the physiological process in a hallucination? The problem is to determine how the brain unconsciously and instantaneously projects an image so perfect and vivid as to deceive the senses into the conviction that it is external. Dream images suffice to establish the existence of some mechanism in the brain by which images appear to the mind to be external and real. In sleep the organs of sense are closed to external stimulus, and judgment and will are suspended, yet the representations are sights and sounds, and the images so vivid in form and action as to induce a conviction of their reality. It is no reckless assumption to suppose that the faculty, whatever it may be, that forms the images unconsciously and instantaneously in dreams, should sometimes be set in motion unconsciously and instantaneously in waking moments, where the results would be modified by the activity of judgment and consciousness.

Where is the image produced : at the sense organ, or in the recesses of the brain ? In ordinary vision the reflection of an object passes through the lenses of the eye and an image is impressed on the retina, which retains it for a brief interval and transmits it along the nerve to the sensorium of the brain, where it is dealt with by the central authority. A vivid impression remains on the organ of sense as an "after image," subsequent to the despatch to the brain. If you look at a strong light and close the eyes a more or less defined image will be present and gradually fade away. Certain physiologists maintain that the image in hallucinations is formed on the sense organ by the brain, as it were, reversing the engine, and sending the concept from the sensorium along the nerve backwards to the sense organ, and resuscitating the image there. In support of this they allege the vividness of the image fully externalised and equally indistinguishable from ordinary sense impressions, and also the supposed similarity to after images. Against this theory the bulk of physiologists and psychologists assert that the image is manipulated in the workshop of the brain from the storehouse of memory, and there remains on view without leaving the shop. Their arguments are mainly negative, based on the difficulties of any other theory. Doctors disagree ; they have not established an admitted theory on the formation of dream images, and hallucinations introduce additional complications. We are not called upon to arbitrate, and can only indicate the direction of the examination into the origin of hallucinations.

Should a natural explanation of these supernormal experiences be discovered, admitted, and established, it would not interfere with or exclude the operation of the supernatural. In allowing the apparition of a saint, Almighty God may present an entirely external figure of any consistency or form, or He may impress the image on the retina, or produce it in the brain, or pass beyond the limits of the material to the soul and permit spirit to recognise spirit without intervention of sense. Granting supernatural interposition, the method becomes of secondary importance. The supernatural would be ascertained by the nature and motive of the experience. It is remarkable how little motive for the appearance is discernible in all the instances of simple hallucinations recorded in the census. The

cases cited above are selected to illustrate different points touched upon, but they are fairly typical of the general character, and testify to the absence of an adequate motive. They are trivial, objectless, often irrelevant, and resemble dreams in being the baseless fabric of a vision.

The present article has been confined to simple hallucinations which comprise four-fifths of the 1684 census cases. In the remaining fifth a connection with a person or incident external to the percipient cannot be explained solely by the subjective state of his mind. When the time of an apparition exactly corresponds with the unknown death of a friend, when information is conveyed that the percipient had not otherwise obtained, when two or more persons share the same experience, it is evident that something more is implied than the formation of an image in the brain. This class of experiences has a higher interest and importance, and shall be considered in a subsequent article.

T. B. SNOW, *Abbot.*

ART. II.—THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE CATHOLIC EPISCOPATE IN RUSSIAN POLAND, TOGETHER WITH A SHORT SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF MONSIGNOR CHARLES HRYNIEWICKI, BISHOP OF VILNA.

NOTWITHSTANDING the Convention made by the late Emperor Alexander III. with Pope Leo XIII. in 1882, which, nominally, was to secure the liberty of the Catholic Church in Poland, the decrees passed during the previous persecution remain in full force. At this moment, as before, the jurisdiction of the Bishops is hindered by the continual interference of the Government in ecclesiastical matters. It is a fact that the Bishop cannot move any priest in his diocese from one parish to another without the permission and the knowledge of the Russian Government. In the same way, the direction of the seminaries depends in a great measure on the political authorities. The secular clergy are so hampered, besides, by exceptional laws and regulations that they cannot move a step out of their own parishes without obtaining a written permission from the Prefect of the district, the omission of which is punished by fines and imprisonment. The local police, besides, act as spies on all they say and do in their churches, report on their sermons, and watch keenly whether any confraternities are established, especially of the Sacred Heart, or if any processions have been allowed. So that the poor parish priests are really at their mercy. But nowhere has this state of things been felt more bitterly than in the Diocese of Vilna, the capital of Lithuania. After the banishment to Viatka (in 1863) of Mgr. Krasinski, this diocese remained for twenty years without its chief pastor. The Diocesan Seminary was nearly empty; the greater part of the parishes were without priests, and the ecclesiastical revenues were diverted to the worst of purposes. In 1883, however, a holy and excellent Bishop was appointed, Mgr. Charles Hryniewicki, who was born at Pulsy in Lithuania, and whose family belonged to the ancient Polish nobility. He

began his studies at the Gymnasium of Bialyskock, then continued them at the Minsk Seminary, and finally at the Academy at St. Petersburg, where he passed the highest examinations and was promoted to the First-Class in scientific subjects at the end of the very first year of his academical course. His great piety, however, was as remarkable as his literary attainments, and he was ordained priest in 1867. His first ecclesiastical appointment was to the Professorship of the College at Oriza in the Province of Mohilev; but in 1869 he was sent, in the same capacity, to the Academy at St. Petersburg, where he remained twelve years. He was also the founder of the Seminary of Mohilev at St. Petersburg, of which he was the first Rector, having been previously made Inspector of the Academy. Soon after, he was created a Canon and Prelate of Mohilev, and in 1883, Bishop of Vilna.

This was, as we may readily imagine, no easy post; but he was young and full of zeal and of the love of souls. His first duty was to try and purify his diocese from the elements which had produced such scandals. On taking possession of his cathedral, he spoke in the following terms:

I will try and root out all abuses and strive to restore order and peace. In this work, I feel I shall have the help and co-operation of all who love our Lord. Let those who resist me know, that it is by the authority of Leo XIII. and by that of the Czar, Alexander III. that I act; and that if they declare war against me, they equally do so against the Pope and the Emperor.

The holy Bishop fancied that by abstaining from every political movement and by remaining a faithful subject of the Czar, he would be free to carry out the reforms which were required in his diocese, and that no one would hinder him from acting according to the laws of the Catholic Church. Cardinal Ledochowski and Archbishop Felinski had similar illusions, till the prison of Ostrow for the first and exile for the other, opened the eyes of both to the dangers of their position.

At first, however, Mgr. Hryniewicki succeeded marvelously in his herculean task. The Governor-General, Todleben, was a good and moderate man and made no objection whatever to the dismissal of scandalous priests. Before the nomination of the new Bishop, Abbé Zylinski had started for Rome, owned his misconduct, did penance for it, and returned

to Vilna, reconciled to the Church. He resumed his duties as parish priest of Ostra-Brama, and the only thing that was exacted from him was, to restore a portion of his large revenues to help in the support of the seminary. But the other offenders felt the strong hand of their new pastor. The Dean of Grodno and the Canon of Vilna (the Abbé Kopeinhowicz) were deprived of their respective offices and excommunicated.

Several other changes were made, and every day the Bishop became more and more beloved by his flock, who realised what it was to have to deal with one who cared for nought but the glory of God and the salvation of souls. But then, unfortunately, there came a change of Governors-General. Todleben went away and was succeeded by General Kochanov, a bitter enemy of the Poles and a violent schismatic. He at once forbid the Bishop to put fresh priests in the place of those who had been excommunicated, and he tried to insist that the Russian language should be used in the Catholic Liturgy. When the Bishop refused, he was told that he had better ask for his passport and leave the country. The Bishop replied: "I did not appoint myself to this arduous charge, nor have I the right to give it up voluntarily and leave my flock as sheep without a shepherd. I am ready to go to Siberia if you exile me; but I will never desert my post." The new Governor finding him so determined, soon found another cause of offence.

In the new Calendar or "Ordo" for 1885, the Bishop had suppressed the names of the two excommunicated priests Kopeinhowicz and Matigsrewicz, who had been deprived of their ecclesiastical posts, although they still received a pension from the Russian Government. This omission displeased the Vilna censor, who insisted on their names being replaced in the "Ordo," and had one reprinted accordingly and sent to the Bishop. Mgr. Hryniewicki, thus circumvented, wrote with his own hand under the names of these two men: "*Excommunicatus Ecclesia. Carolus Episcopus:*" and the "Ordo," thus annotated, was sent to all the clergy. The Governor, furious at what he considered rebellion against his authority, wrote to St. Petersburg and said that it was impossible for him to remain Governor of Vilna with such a man as the

Bishop. To try and arrange matters, Prince Kantakuzen Spéransky, the director of the Chancery of Foreign Religions, was sent to Vilna, and he again advised the Bishop to resign, nominally on the plea of his health.

But the Bishop replied that he was perfectly well and had no intention of leaving the country. The Prince returned to St. Petersburg, and a few days later Mgr. Hryniewicki received a summons to come to the capital to give some further information as to his diocese. The Bishop knew at once the meaning of this journey. He felt convinced that he would not be allowed to return to his flock for a long time, if ever, and he prepared himself for exile.

When the news of his approaching departure reached the people, the deepest sorrow and distress was shown by everyone. All the principal inhabitants of the town hastened to the railway station to see their beloved pastor, perhaps for the last time, and to receive his episcopal blessing. It was on February 3, 1885, that he passed through the streets in his carriage for the last time, blessing his people as he passed, who were ranged on both sides of the road to see him. When he got into the railway carriage, seeing the great crowd round him, he spoke the following words:

Listen, my children, to what I am going to say to you. Do not cry or shout—but listen, for the time is short. I bless you and your families and all you love with my whole heart. Live in charity and union with one another; pray earnestly for grace and strength; fulfil the duties of our holy faith; bear patiently the persecution of our enemies. God has commanded us to love our neighbour as ourselves, and are not our enemies likewise our neighbours? Love God above all and your holy religion and your country. Obey the Emperor, for he is set over you by God, and you must render to him what is his due as you render unto God what is His. Remember me also in your prayers. I grieve to leave you, for though I have done all I could, there is still much that is wanting and which I hoped to accomplish in the next few years. Do not cry perhaps I may come back to you, though I do not think so. . . . [Here the cries of the people stifled the Bishop's voice.] Do not cry, I repeat, my children, it is God's will, and to that we must all submit. Listen once more. There are some people who say I am a rebel; if they can say so of one who has had no thought but that of defending the Church and our holy Catholic Faith Well, if that be "rebellion," I shall remain a rebel to the hour of my death! I have always faithfully obeyed God and the Emperor and shall

do so to the grave. It is enough, my children. Farewell ! and may we meet again in heaven if not on earth !

No sooner had he arrived in St. Petersburg than he begged to see the Czar, but he was absent. Then he tried to see the Minister, Tolstoy, but he was ill. For a time there was a question of sending him as Bishop to the Diocese of Ptock, as the see was vacant owing to the death of Mgr. Borowski. But the enemies of the holy Bishop prevailed, and very soon he received the following decree of exile :

His Majesty the Emperor, at my humble request, has relieved you from the government of the Diocese of Vilna, and has destined you to reside in the Town of Jaroslav. I have the honour to announce to you this the will of his Majesty and to desire its instant accomplishment.

(Signed) TOLSTOY and KANTAKUZEN SPÉRANSKY.

On February 10, accordingly, the Bishop left St. Petersburg and arrived at Jaroslav on the Volga, accompanied by a policeman. The news flew like wildfire through the Diocese of Vilna, and the grief and despair of the people is well expressed in the following letter :

A heavy sorrow and loss has fallen upon us, for once more we are orphaned and desolate. We had such an excellent and venerable pastor, who never spared himself day or night for the welfare of his flock ; who plucked out the weeds and sowed the good grain in his fields ; who was the father and friend of us all. But human malice, aided and inspired by the Devil, has torn away our treasure from us, and God knows whether we shall ever see him again ! ' Oh, in what sad and terrible times we are living ! All the enemies of God are rejoicing in their victory, and the fanaticism of the schismatics increase day by day. Our town is like a besieged city, and on all sides one hears nothing but sadness and sorrow.

Before leaving Vilna, Mgr. Hryniewicki had entrusted the administration of his diocese to his Vicar-General, Mgr. Harasimowicz, until the Apostolic See had chosen a successor to himself ; and at the first meeting of the Chapter, the Abbé Zylinski was the most anxious to declare that the priest chosen by the Bishop was the only canonical director of the diocese. But the Government was not at all disposed to admit the claims of a man who would follow in the steps of the deposed pastor, and M. Harasimowicz was sent off to the

little town of Welsk in the Government of Wotohda. Before leaving he named the Abbé Constant Majewski as his successor in the administration of the diocese, he having been Rector of the Seminary at Vilna. But again the Governor interfered with this nomination and speedily exiled the Abbé Majewski to Wotohda. This sentence was executed with such rapidity that he had not the time to name a successor, and so the diocese remained without an administrator, save the General Chapter. This sad state of things has given a death-blow to the ecclesiastical life of the diocese, which had only just begun to recover from the evils which had subsisted unchecked for twenty years. The number of priests has been reduced to twenty-three. Out of 295 parishes seventy-five have disappeared and the Catholic population has equally diminished.

But we must return to the exiled Bishop. He remained for five years at Jaroslav, enduring every species of petty vexation at the hands of the Government, especially during the first two years, which he bore with his accustomed patience and resignation. At last a new Bishop was appointed to Vilna, and as there was therefore no possible excuse for his detention at Jaroslav, he was given leave to depart. But owing to the ill-will of the Government, his liberation was delayed for several months. The new Bishop had been consecrated on December 30, 1889, but it was not till the following May that the Head of the Police communicated this new decree to his prisoner :

His Majesty the Emperor has deigned to permit the late Bishop of Vilna to leave the country, without any question of returning, and considers it to be indispensable that he should take the following route:—Moscow, Toulā, Orel, Koursk, Kieff, Voloczysk; and that without any stopping or interruption. A subsidy of 1500 roubles is allotted to the Bishop out of the ecclesiastical funds, but which will be only paid at the end of the year and at the demand of the Bishop, if it be proved that the said Bishop has done nothing contrary to the wish of the Government during that period.

The Head of the Police exacted a written declaration from the Bishop that he would accept these conditions, which Mgr. Hryniewicki, with his usual calm dignity, accepted, writing :

I will leave on the 15th, and take the route which has been indicated.

BISHOP HRYNIEWICKI.

The following account of his journey is taken from the *Przeglad*, or *Lemberg Review*, No. 144, June 25, 1890 :

When the day of departure arrived and the Bishop got into the carriage, he found that he was to be accompanied by the Head of the Police of Jaroslav in full uniform. On Friday, May 16, the train reached Moscow, and he was instantly met by a large body of police, who rudely demanded his luggage, and insisted on his instant departure for the Kursk Station. A carriage had been prepared, into which they roughly pushed the Bishop, who exclaimed, "What do you mean by treating me as a malefactor? Do you wish to assassinate me? You have not the slightest right to act as you are doing, for I have signed a declaration that I will in all things conform to the wishes of the Emperor. I am ill, and want a short rest; do not, therefore, hurry me in this manner!"

To this remonstrance only fresh brutality was added, to the great indignation of the public, who were witnesses of the whole scene. The Bishop, to avoid any further insults, accordingly got into the carriage, telling the police that he could not pay for it, as the Government did not give him the means to do so. He asked to stop at a shop to buy a hat as his own had been spoiled in the journey, but this was positively refused. As soon as he arrived at the Kursk Station he was forced to enter the carriage, which had been prepared for him a long time before the train started. Two secret police agents accompanied him, watching every movement and listening to every word he said. Other members of the police force remained at the door of the railway carriage, of which the windows were closely veiled. A quantity of writing paper and telegram forms had been prepared to induce the Bishop to write, but he declined to do so. As soon as he had entered the carriage the door was locked on the outside, so that he was virtually a prisoner. He had wished to go second-class on account of the expense, but that was also refused; and every effort was made to separate him from his chaplain and his servant, but the Bishop declared that he would not travel alone, and finally took three first-class tickets. The police agents then got into the next carriage. At each station they urged him to get out and eat; but he refused, and touched only what he had brought from Jaroslav, while his servant prepared him some tea. On nearing Kieff a strange thing happened. The Bishop had fallen into an uneasy slumber, when he was suddenly awakened by a violent rush of air from underneath his seat. He sprang up, calling for help, and found that under his chair a trap had opened, which caused this strong wind—a fact which in all probability saved his life. The guard of the train was summoned, and seemed very much astonished. The spies also came in, and were evidently greatly confused and embarrassed. But the Bishop insisted on being moved into another carriage, and so arrived safely at Kieff. There again they had to change trains, and the same pressure was used to force the Bishop at once into the compartment prepared for

him. But he insisted on walking a little, as the train was not to start for another hour. On the platform the Bishop met with an old friend, with whom he entered into conversation, greatly to the wrath of his guards. On his resuming his place in the railway carriage a poor woman and her children insisted on entering it to obtain his blessing, which the spies tried in vain to prevent. It was on May 17 that the holy Bishop left Kieff and arrived at the frontier station of Voloczysk, where the Russian police disappeared like a bad dream, and the poor persecuted prelate could at last breathe freely; and, having taken leave of his chaplain, was received with affectionate veneration by his co-religionists in Galicia, who hastened to offer him the most cordial hospitality.

We leave this authentic report of the Bishop's journey without comment. In the year 1891 he went to Rome, where he was created Archbishop of Perge; and until better times arise, he is now acting as simple parish priest on the property of a friend in Galicia.

His successor at Vilna, Mgr. Awdziwicz, finds himself in an almost equally difficult position. One of the most important works of a Bishop is the visitation of his diocese and the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation; but the Russian Government does all in its power to hinder these episcopal functions, and in some cases, as with Mgr. Koztowski in the Diocese of Lublin, it forbids them altogether. In the Warsaw Diocese the priests who came to hear the confessions of their people in the town, where the Archbishop was confirming, have been condemned to a heavy fine, because they had gone out of the limits of their respective parishes without asking the permission of the Head of the Police. In August 1893, Mgr. Awdziwicz undertook the canonical visitation of fifteen churches in the Diaconate of Lida Radunsk, where, and for thirty-two years, there had been no episcopal visitation. He had the greatest difficulty in obtaining this permission, and finally did so on the following conditions:

1. That he should obtain the express permission of Orziweski, the Governor-General of Vilna.

2. That he should not have with him or convoke more than six priests.

3. Severe prohibition to the parishioners to receive the Bishop on his visitation with any triumphal or solemn demonstrations.

4. The Prefect of the district and the local police to follow the Bishop in his pastoral visitation, to accompany him into the church and to remain there, especially at the time of the administration of the Sacraments and of the Confirmation, lest any of the orthodox (that is, the Uniats, forced by violence into schism) should share in a Catholic function. Even at dinner, the Prefect or his representative was to be present to watch the proceedings of the Bishop and his clergy.

By a recent decree, it has been forbidden to the parochial clergy to invite more than two priests to assist at any function in their churches, and these must have a special permission, in writing, from the Prefect of the district. The local police are equally obliged to watch over the performance of these functions in the church itself.

In 1886 another Imperial Decree prohibited the Bishops from building any oratory or chapel, even in the most urgent cases, without a special permission from the Government. In June of that year, a decree suppressed altogether two parochial churches of Sledziany and Granow, in the Diocese of Lublin, because they had allowed the Uniats to participate in the sacraments and functions of these churches. But the hardest decree for the poor Catholics was issued in 1891, by the Governor of Siedlce, severely prohibiting the repairs or restoration or enlargement of any Catholic church, without the permission of the Government, although the money might have been offered by individuals or by the subscriptions of the faithful. In consequence, many of the churches have fallen into ruins and have had to be closed.

In April 1893 an Imperial Decree suppressed the Seminary of Siedlce for four years, the Rector, Vice-Rector, and five priests, who were professors of this seminary, having been incarcerated in the Citadel of Warsaw. The first two and Professor Prawola are still in prison; the other four, after paying 1000 roubles, were released. Of the sixty students, thirteen were precluded from entering any seminary in the empire. What was their crime? None was alleged, save "a spirit of Polish hostility to the Government;" though no proof whatever of this was given and there had not been the smallest political movement among either students or professors.

A last decree of January 1894 imposes the law that all the

correspondence of the Catholic clergy with their respective Bishops shall be carried on in the Russian language.

We think we have said enough of the grave difficulties of the episcopate in this country. So much has been written about the desire for union with the Holy See, that people are apt to imagine that such an event may speedily be accomplished. The known spirit of toleration of the new Czar, the permission (for the first time) to allow the circulation in Russia of the Papal Encyclicals, the appointment of a permanent minister to the Holy See, and the leave granted to the Bishops to visit Rome, have given Europe the idea that the era of persecution is a thing of the past. But they forget two things: the absolute power possessed by the Governor and other authorities in each province to carry out any measures they may see fit, and the impossibility of the truth being known to the Czar, both from the size of the country and the character of those around him. Every Russian is firmly convinced that the Poles are continually conspiring against the Government and look with suspicion upon their every word and deed. They are equally convinced that, as a nation, they are more tolerant than any other people on the face of the earth, and that it is only zeal for the "orthodox" church which induces some of their number to resort to measures hostile to Catholicity. Until these two misconceptions are removed we despair of any real change in the administration of Russian Poland. Added to these reasons, is the known hostility of the Holy Synod to the Catholic faith, and their determination, if possible, to eliminate any symptom of adhesion to it among the inhabitants of their conquered provinces.

Yet, in spite of persecution of every kind—fines, imprisonment, exile and even death—the Ruthenians, Lithuanians and Uniats cling to their religious convictions, and, year by year, swell the lists of Martyrs for the Faith. How earnestly then should we all follow the desire of the Holy Father in his late Encyclical and pray for that union which can alone bring peace to the Christian world and stop the systematic persecution of the Catholic Church in Russian Poland, which, though often ignored in other European countries, is a grave and undoubted reality.

MARY ELIZABETH HERBERT.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE: THE TWO STAGES OF THEIR INTER- RELATION.

THE two previous papers of this series* first discriminated between the Bible *quâ* human document, and, as such, one of the several proofs for the Church's authority, and the Bible *quâ* Divine Library, re-given to us as such by that authority. They next maintained that, in the first, pre-Catholic Faith stage, Reason is necessarily in its element, and that, in the second, the Catholic Faith stage, Reason is not contradicted but transcended. And they finally attempted an exposition of such conclusions of the Critico-historical Reason as, in the first stage, would seem to impose themselves on our acceptance, and of how these conclusions leave still intact, indeed sometimes strengthen the evidence for those few great facts on which the Church, as far as the Bible goes, is built. I will now attempt in this concluding paper—here more than ever in the hands of the Church—once more to insist upon the several functions of Faith and Reason, the Church and Science in these two stages; to illustrate the temper of mind in which the second stage should be approached; and, finally, to indicate such conclusions of the Church as here impose themselves on our acceptance, and how such conclusions are compatible with, indeed but light up and harmonise, the previously ascertained phenomena of the Bible with each other, and their totality with the life of the soul and of the Church.

I.

1. If there is a specifically Catholic fundamental conception, it is that of the two divinely instituted, humanly necessary, immortal orders of Nature and Grace, Reason and Faith, neither identical nor antagonistic, but distinct and supplementary. Indeed, what is all that long conflict on the right hand and on

* DUBLIN REVIEW, Oct. 1894, pp. 313-341; April 1895, pp. 306-337. In the second paper, read, p. 311, line 13, "and *Charlemagne's death* (817 A.D.);" and p. 330, line 16, "as being *the children of Rachel*, Benjamin's mother, *who lay buried by Bethlehem*."

the left, first with Pelagianism and Manichæism, later on with Laxism and Jansenism, last with Rationalism and Fideism, but an historical confirmation, throughout her secular history, of this the Church's inalienable attitude?

St. Thomas tells us that

"Grace does not abolish nature, but perfects it"; and that "although the truth of the Christian Faith exceeds the capacity of human reason, yet those principles which the reason possesses by nature cannot contradict this truth. For these principles are most certain and true, so that neither is it possible to hold them to be false, nor to deny that which is held by Faith, since it is so evidently confirmed by God."*

Hence, on the one hand, St. Thomas can rightly say: "He who strives to prove by natural reason the Trinity of Persons, dishonours Faith."† And, on the other hand, Dr. Hettinger can declare:

Although, with regard to the truths of Revelation, the finite, human Reason is not the positive (*principium secundum quod*), still less the productive principle (*principium quo*) of truth, yet the Reason is a negative principle, since nothing can be true which contradicts its laws.‡

Dr. Martineau remarks most correctly:

In reasoning with the Catholic, we have always this advantage, that he admits a natural reason, a natural conscience, a natural religion; nay, that the light which we have through them is a grace of the same Holy Spirit which makes his Church the depository of higher but homogeneous gifts.§

2. And it is important to remember that Revelation does not simply propose to us principles, a philosophy, transcending our natural discovery or comprehension, but also persons and facts, a history. And hence, as that transcendent philosophy presupposes the absolute certainty of the first principles of the human reason on which the previous, intra-rational philosophy is built, so also this transcendent history presupposes the human credibility, attainable by ordinary historical proofs and methods, of those fundamental facts and events with which the Reason begins and which Faith appropriates and transcends. Neither in the case of the philosophy, nor in that of the history,

* "C. Gent.," i. 7.

† "Summa Theol.," i. qu. 32, a. 1.

‡ "Fundamental-Theologie," 1879, i. pp. 144, 145.

§ "Seat of Authority," 1890, p. 131.

can faith be based on scepticism; however great the share of grace on the one hand, and of the pure heart on the other, a spring-board is wanted from and beyond which the divinely enlightened and attracted will may plunge into the divine certainties of supernatural faith.

Hence, just as M. Bonnetty had to subscribe the philosophical thesis: "Reasoning can prove with certainty the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul, the free will of man," so also Abbé Bautain had to subscribe the historical theses:

"We have no right to require an unbeliever to admit the Resurrection of Our Lord, before that certain proofs have been administered to him; and these proofs are deduced from (written and oral) tradition by reasoning," and: "Reason can prove with certainty the authenticity of the Revelation vouchsafed to the Jews through Moses and to Christians through Jesus Christ."*

3. Now the jurisdiction of the faith and of the Church will, in both the philosophical and historical questions, be, in the first stage, as generally indirect and predominantly disciplinary, as in the second stage it will be direct and doctrinal as well as disciplinary.

In the first stage, this jurisdiction watches, in the case of both sets of questions, against the introduction of the three kinds of Rationalism and the corresponding kinds of Fideism, which alone, but frequently, appear here. I will divide these intruders into prior, concomitant and posterior, and will consider them only in their application to critico-historical questions.

(1) (a) The historical investigation often starts with prior Rationalism, antitheistic assumptions.

Hence, the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* condemns those who deny the possibility of prophecy or miracle.†

We want, then, right assumptions and presumptions, since do without them of some kind we cannot; such noble historians as J. G. Droysen, Ranke, Rudolf Kittel, give us such presumptions substantially the same as those required by the Church.

(b) Or, sometimes the investigation starts with prior Fideism, Catholic assumptions.

* Denzinger's "Encheiridion," ed. 1888, Nos. 1506, 1491, 1493.

† *Tablet*, Jan. 6, 1894, p. 7.

Hence, Abbé Bautain had to sign the thesis that “(supernatural) Faith, a divine gift, is subsequent to Revelation,” and that “the use of Reason precedes Faith and leads man to it by means of Revelation and of grace.”* And the Encyclical tells us: “The first thing to be done is to vindicate the trustworthiness of the sacred records, at least as human documents.”† Professor Robertson Smith, then, says quite correctly: “All sound apologetic admits that the proof that a book is credible must precede belief that it is inspired.”‡

(2) (a) The investigation often proceeds with a concomitant Rationalism, ‘accepting the too hurried and too subjective conclusions of individual scholars as though they were the calm and final word of science.

Hence the Encyclical says: “This vaunted ‘Higher Criticism’ will resolve itself into the reflection of the bias and the prejudice of the critics.”§ The distinguished American New Testament scholar, Dr. Thayer, says, then, very truly:

Anybody who has watched the changing fashions of criticism can call to mind one person and another who caught up with avidity the view that happened to be in vogue among the so-called “advanced” critics and still clings to it. In critical theories the rhymester’s advice is as good as respecting fashions in clothes—“Be not the first by whom the new are tried, Nor yet the last to lay the old aside.”||

(b) Or, sometimes, the investigation is unduly checked by a concomitant Fideism, by theologians refusing assent to the well-established conclusions of scholarship on points well within its competence.

Such was the case in the long refusal of the Protestants of the seventeenth century to admit the late introduction of the Hebrew vowel-points.

“Nowadays every one knows,” writes Professor Sanday, “that the Hebrew of the Old Testament was written purely in consonants without vowels; these were added in the sixth or seventh centuries A.D. This was first made out by the French Calvinist Louis Cappellus in 1624. But the set of opinion throughout the Reformed Churches was so strong that a later work by Cappellus could only be published (in 1650) by the help of his son, who had joined the Church of Rome. Indeed, in one of the

* Denzinger, *loc. cit.*, Nos. 1488, 1493.

† *Tablet*, *loc. cit.*, p. 9.

‡ “Old Testament in Jewish Church,” ed. 1892, p. 312.

§ *Tablet*, *loc. cit.*, p. 10.

|| *Critical Review*, v. iii. p. 207.

Swiss formularies (1675) it is expressly laid down that not only the Hebrew consonants but also the vowel-points were divinely inspired.”*

(3) (a) The investigation often concludes with posterior Rationalism, anti-Catholic conclusions, and this by denying any ulterior source or range of truth other than its own.

Hence the Encyclical bids

“the Catholic student bear well in mind, as the Fathers teach in numerous passages, that the (divine, dogmatico-moral) sense of Holy Scripture can nowhere be found incorrupt outside of the Church, and cannot be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw the bark of the Sacred Scripture, and never attain its pith.” “False philosophy and rationalism must lead to the elimination from the Sacred writings of all that is outside the natural order.”†

The Bollandist Père de Smedt tells us :

A supernatural fact, taken historically, is composed of two elements. It is first of all a fact, and next a fact possessing a supernatural character. For establishing the fact, we have no other critical rules than those which guide us in the research of natural facts; for establishing its supernatural character, we have to content ourselves with the purely negative demonstration that none of the (natural) explanations proposed can satisfy a candid mind, that all are contrary to the assured laws of the metaphysical, physical or moral order.‡

(b) Or, the posterior Rationalism may be positive, attempting to prove, by internal evidence alone, the Church-attested Inspiration and dogmatic meaning of the Bible. So all Protestant bodies, more or less.

To sum up. The Church’s jurisdiction, throughout this first stage, would seem to be, ordinarily,§ indirect and disciplinary. She sees to it that the investigation starts with neither less nor more than Theistic assumptions; that, in proceeding, it neither prematurely accepts but partial, short-lived opinions nor rejects the unanimous, lasting conclusions of scholars as to the historico-literary phenomena; and that it

* “Oracles of God,” 1891, pp. 20, 21.

† *Tablet*, loc. cit., pp. 9, 10.

‡ “Des Devoirs des Ecrivains Catholiques,” p. 12.

§ With Abbé Loisy I would say: “Questions of origin and composition remain, even for the Bible, questions of literary history, depending directly upon historical testimony and critical examination. The Church has never yet defined the authorship, method of composition, or textual condition of any Biblical book. But she most certainly could do so, since these facts are directly related to the object of Revelation, although not included in it.”—“Études Bibliques,” reprint 1894, pp. 50, 51.

does not conclude with denying the subsequent supernatural verities concerning the Bible, nor with attempting to itself establish these as within its own competence. Hence, where scholarship starts from, and everywhere applies Theistic assumptions, and does not deny the possibility of a subsequent supernatural teacher of subsequent supernatural truths about and from the Bible, but restricts itself to the middle region of forwarding research into the historico-literary phenomena of Scripture, there it is in possession. Where it has thus arrived at unanimity, faith joins with common sense in accepting its conclusions.

4. In the second, Catholic-Faith stage, Faith not Reason, Doctrine not Science, are in possession: the Church's jurisdiction is here always direct, and doctrinal as well as disciplinary. Here, in virtue of her now admitted divine authority, she proposes to us certain facts and doctrines concerning the supernatural meaning and character of the Bible, of an admittedly transcendental character. Here the reality and true *raison d'être* of the mere phenomena of the Bible are reached at last, and reached with the divine certainty of Faith.

(1) She proposes to us the Canon of Scripture, and that as based on her own authority, and rejects all attempts at including or excluding books or parts of books, according to direct internal evidence of their supposed fitness or unfitness, as unreasonable and Rationalistic.

The Councils of Trent and of the Vatican repeat the Canon of the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), and of the Decrees of Popes St. Damasus (about 374) and Innocent I. (405) and define: "If any one shall not receive these books in their entirety with all their parts, as sacred and canonical, let him be anathema."

(2). She next proposes to us these particular books as all divinely inspired throughout, and this again, on her own authority, and as beyond all direct conclusive proof.

"The Church holds these books," defines the Vatican Council, "to be sacred and canonical, because, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author, and have been handed over to the Church as such."* "The system of those who con-

* Denzinger, *loc. cit.*, Nos. 666, 1637.

cede that Inspiration regards only the things of Faith and Morals cannot be tolerated," says the Encyclical.*

Her authority does not constitute their Inspiration, but is our only conclusive proof for its reality, nature and extent.

(3) She finally proposes to us the Revelation contained in the Bible, and that as inerrant and transcendent.

"The books of the Old and New Testaments," defines the Vatican Council, "contain Revelation without error;" and (renewing the decree of Trent) "in matters of Faith and Morals, pertaining unto the edification of the Christian Faith, that sense of Scripture is to be held to be the true one which the Church has held and holds, whose prerogative it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture."†

Here again, of the whereabouts, the nature and the meaning of Biblical Revelation, the Church is alone the appointed, fully competent and conclusive witness and teacher.

II.

I will next consider successive and contrasted stages of knowledge and belief in various subject-matters, as apparently instructive illustrations of the temper of mind specially adapted to our second stage.

1. Take the relations between Physics and Metaphysics.

That penetrating Catholic scientist, M. P. Duhem, contends that :

"The experimental method reposes upon principles which are self-evident and prior to all Metaphysic;" hence that "it belongs to Metaphysic to account for the self-evident foundations on which Physic rests, but this study adds nothing to their (physical) evidence and certainty;" again, that "unless you establish a real distinction between Physic and Metaphysic, you are bound to recognise the physical method even in Metaphysic, that is; to accept Positivism;" and, finally, that "the sane and prudent tradition of the Schools has never entirely disappeared: at all times these have been Physicists, the greatest through their discoveries, who have recognised that mathematical theories have for their object the co-ordination of the natural laws, and that the research into their causes constitutes another problem.‡

Apply this to the human and the divine side of Scripture, and we get Professor Robertson Smith telling us :

* *Tablet*, *loc. cit.*, p. 10.

† Denzinger, *loc. cit.*, Nos. 668, 1636, 1637.

‡ "Physique et Metaphysique," 1893, pp. 10, 12, 19, 30.

The whole business of scholarly exegesis lies with the human side of Scripture, with the mastering of the whole situation and character and feeling of each human interlocutor in the drama of Revelation. What is more than this lies beyond our wisdom. It is only the Spirit of God that can make the word a living word to our hearts, as it was a living word to him who first received it.*

A distinguished Catholic critic writes :

M. Renan did not see that the divine-human reality of religion had to manifest itself by means of phenomena, and that the purely scientific observation of these phenomena cannot determine the law that underlies them.†

This is solely the business of the Church.

2. Take the relations between Physiology, Psychology, and Metaphysic.

Strict Neo-scholastics, *e.g.*, Dr. A. Stoeckl, tell us that "empirical psychology is a fit, indeed necessary, preliminary to philosophy proper." And then as introductory to psychology itself, he gives some account of human anatomy and physiology.‡

Apply this to questions of date, composition, adaptation, development on the one hand, and those of Canonicity, Inspiration, Revelation, theological Interpretation on the other hand, and you will find it impossible to argue from the latter to the former, *e.g.*, that the Pentateuch cannot be a mosaic of four great documents, but must be all composed by Moses, because it is all inspired ; as impossible as to prove, from the soul being the "form" of the body, that a particular number and kind of bones and ligaments is in the human hand or foot.

3. Take the difference between (culpable) Nature and Grace as propounded by faith.

Cardinal Newman tells us :

"There are two parties on this earth, two only, if we view men in their religious aspect : those few who hear Christ's words and follow Him, and those many for whom Christ prays not, though He died for them." But the world "considers that all men are pretty much on a level ; that it is impossible to divide them into two bodies, or to divide them at all." They may indeed "be easily mistaken for each other, for the difference is largely inward and secret." §

* "Old Testament in Jewish Church," ed. 1892, p. 13.

† *Bulletin Critique*, 1895, p. 428.

‡ "Lehrbuch d. Philosophie," ed. 1881, pp. 21-37.

§ "Discourses," ed. 1871, pp. 147, 148, 152.

Apply this to the question of the difference between Biblical and other books ; in both cases we get the Church warranting a difference intrinsic but resting on transcendent grounds ; we can believe, we cannot directly and conclusively prove it.

4. Take our Lord's Humanity in relation to His Divinity. Cardinal Hergenroether tells us :

"The Apostle John combats in his Epistles false teachers who denied the reality of the Incarnation, quite in the manner of the later Gnostics; they attributed to our Lord but a seeming body, and hence were strict *Docetæ*." "One of the fundamental traits of Gnosticism is its absolute antinomy between spirit and matter. The latter is conceived either as unsubstantial, as chaos, or, more usually, as identical with evil; hence follows the negation of Christ's true humanity and corporality."*

Apply this to Scripture, and we must beware of any Scriptural Docetism, parallel to the Christological one. The Inlitteration of the Spirit is as real in the one case, as the Incarnation of the Son is in the other. Our Lord's body weighed a particular weight on His mother's arm ; the hands that blessed and healed, the eyes that wept and broke were, are, of a particular size and shape and colour. The Spirit's letter is composed of such and such documents of a definite age and length and literary complexion. In both cases the Faith tells us that Reason can thus observe and register, and bids Reason do so as far as possible.

5. Take the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in its relation to Faith and Reason :

"The divine Trinity is, for the human, indeed every created mind, in so far a mystery, as that the reality of the three persons in God cannot be proved by its natural powers. Indeed, even the intellectual apprehension of this mystery cannot be other than analogical, and therefore obscure and imperfect; more so, indeed, than the apprehension of God's nature and essence." "Yet this incomprehensibleness has at times been emphasised in such a manner as to make it almost appear as though God had revealed this mystery for the purpose of propounding a riddle to man, and not of enriching his mind with an exceedingly sublime and fruitful cognition."†

And Dr. Hettinger finds the contribution of reason to this human cognition in the correct positive and negative apprehension of the Church's definitions of the dogma; in the proofs of its antiquity from

* "Hanbuch d. Kirchengeschichte," ed. 1876, i. pp. 114, 119.

† "Dogmatik," 1873, i.. Nos. 1078, 1086.

Scripture and Tradition ; and in the attempt, by means of the analogies of the life of the human soul, to fathom this mystery as far as possible.*

Apply this to Scripture, and the Church's trinity of doctrine concerning it will also be neither directly demonstrable nor completely comprehensible, yet the same fourfold contribution of reason will here also be possible and desirable towards its ever-increasing apprehension as a doctrine intrinsically true and fruitful, harmonious and harmonising.

III.

We will now take the Church's three transcendent doctrines, in the order of the degree of their transcendence ; hence, first, Canoncity.

(1) Now the sacred and canonical character of the Biblical books is but the exact application and delimitation of the character of divinity to certain definite books. And since human certainty as to the divinity of Scripture, its content and origin, is attainable by the natural reason,† it seems to follow that the divinity of single books is so likewise. Yet it will be safer to contend that the nucleus alone of the Old and New Testaments can be thus proved, with human certainty, to be divine ; and that only after this or other reasons have occasioned the act of divine faith in the Church, does the mind get sufficient certainty either human or divine as to the divinity of some of the books which fringe the Old and New Testament Canons. By my human certainty as to the divine character of the Law and the Prophets in the Old Testament, and of the Gospels and the great Pauline Epistles in the New Testament, I get occasion for my act of faith in the Church ; and the Church then gives me divine certainty, not only as to these books, but also as to such of the Hagiographa and of the Deutero-canonicals of the Old and New Testaments as yield me but an uncertain human assurance. The case appears analogous to the difference between natural and supernatural knowledge of the Unity and Attributes of God.

(2) Canoncity and Inspiration.

* "Apologie," ed. 1869, iii. p. 85.

† Cf. Schell's "Dogmatik," i., 1889, p. 122.

"Canonicity concerns in the first place not Inspiration," says Professor Schanz, "but apostolic authorship (or attestation) and all involved by it. Once its apostolic origin is certain a document will be inspired for him who believes in special apostolic graces. Even as to the Old Testament, the ground of early Christian belief in it was the authority of the Apostles, otherwise it would have been impossible for St. Paul to take up an oppositional attitude towards the Old Law."*

"For the consciousness of the Westerns," writes Dr. Harnack "(e.g., Irenæus, Tertullian, the Muratorian fragment), Apostolicity is undoubtedly the primary quality of the New Testament collection, and this involves Inspiration. At Alexandria the term Apostle is taken in a wider sense, and is made to include the seventy disciples (Luke x. 1.)"†

Hence Canonicity, as equal to Apostolicity, in this wider sense, is not simply identical with Inspiration though it involves the latter; nor can we directly prove this Canonicity for all the Old and New Testament writings, e.g., the Canticle of Canticles and the Second Epistle of St. Peter.

(3) Now the following positions are admitted with regard to the Old Testament Canon :

"As a question of principle," writes Abbé Loisy, "the origin of the Old Testament Canon coincides with the redaction and first promulgation of the Law. As a matter of fact the Law becomes fully, finally canonical by its official promulgation through Esdras (444 B.C.)." "The collection of the Prophets did not receive this promulgation, but recommended itself only by the value attaching to each of its parts before their final union by Nehemiah (432 B.C.)." "So also with the collection of the Hagiographa, which, because of its heterogeneity, was longer before acquiring a final form; the Bible of Judas Maccabæus (161 B.C.) probably contained it complete." "There exists but one Jewish Canon, the Palestinian, with a difference of appreciation and of practice as to the non-canonical religious books. Jerusalem, without being hostile to them, hesitates to admit them as divine, and excludes them from her sacred collection; Alexandria venerates them as sacred and inspired, and uses them much as she does the canonical books with which she confounds them in her Bible, though her official Canon remains the same as that of the metropolis. The Apostles and apostolic men will have formed for themselves a Greek Bible by taking, in the contemporary Alexandrian collections, such books as they regarded as inspired, i.e., the books of the Hebrew Canon and also the Deutero-canonicals which we see that they used. It is this Apostolic Bible which they bequeathed to the Church, and the Church instructs us of its true extent."‡

* "Theol. Quartalschrift," 1895, pp. 201, 198.

† "Dogmengeschichte," i., ed. 1888, pp. 318, 322.

‡ "Canon de l'A. T.," pp. 53, 54, 65, 69, 70.

(4) The Canonicity of a book is distinct from its traditional authorship. (a) The conciliar definitions of Canonicity bear directly only on the divine and authoritative character of the book. Indeed, as the fullest belief in the Church's *magisterium* as to dogmatic facts, as to her having and exercising the power of inerrantly defining, not only that particular propositions are of faith or heretical, but that a particular book or part of a book contains them, in no wise involves belief in any inerrancy in designating the actual author of the document in question: so neither does the fullest belief in the actual exercise of her infallible *magisterium* in defining a particular book to be canonical, necessarily involve the exercise of her power to define the human authorship.

Bishop Hefele tells us: "The Fifth General Council no doubt anathematised Origen." Yet the very strict Dr. Scheeben tells us: "Interior assent to such a judgment is required only in so far as there is no reasonable ground for assuming that the censured expressions do not really proceed from the person named. Reasonable grounds for this may be producible where, as here, judgment is passed on very ancient writings, especially where no examination of the authorship has preceded the decision as to the theological character of the writings."* So, again, Fénelon could, with complete submission to the Brief of 1699, explain to the Pope in 1712, that one of the censured propositions was indeed "erroneous," and had appeared in his book, but was not his.†

"As to Biblical authorship," writes Abbé Loisy, "the Church no doubt could emit an infallible decision in the matter, yet up to now she has never defined the authorship or method of composition, but only the Inspiration and Canonicity of the Biblical books."‡

The Councils and Popes, in their canonical lists, have but followed the current, sometimes unscientific, attributions. Thus the Synods of Hippo and III. Carthage (393, 397, A.D.) and Pope Innocent I. (417) put down "the five books of Solomon," meaning by this, says Dr. Kaulen, "Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus."§ Now these authorities can hardly have even thought that Solomon (about 933) was the author of Ecclesiasticus (written about 185 B.C.). As to Wisdom, "its origin should be referred approximately

* "Conciliengeschichte," v. ii., ed. 1875, pp. 861, 898; "Dogmatik," i. p. 259.

† "Œuvres," ed. 1822, v. ix. p. 618. ‡ "Études Bibliques," pp. 50, 51.

§ Denzinger, *loc. cit.*, Nos. 49, 59; "Einleitung," p. 289.

to the time of Ptolemy Philopator" (about 222-204 B.C.).* As to Ecclesiastes, Bishop Haneberg, Dr. Kaulen, Cardinal Newman, Abbé Loisy allow or incline to a post-exilic date; Dr. Bickell explicitly maintains it.†

(b) The Fathers, again, are primary authorities as to Faith and Morals; all are truthful transmitters of traditional opinions; some few, above all Origen and St. Jerome, are also scholars capable of testing historical evidence; but the majority are more trustworthy as to the fact of the Canonicity of the single books, than as to their precise authorship. Wisdom was usually attributed to Solomon up to St. Jerome's time; the legend of Esdras re-dictating all the Books of the Hebrew Canon was fully believed by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria; and that of the seventy Greek translators of the Old Testament having each translated independently and yet identically is believed, among others, by St. Irenæus.‡

(c) Jewish tradition, again, requires careful sifting. Philo (15 B.C.) and Josephus (about 115 A.D.) specially insist upon Moses having himself written even the last chapter of Deuteronomy descriptive of his own death. And Philo's conception of the Law is so elastic, that in one place he refers to the Psalter under that name.§

"According to a well-known passage in the Talmud," writes Professor Robertson Smith, "even the Prophets and Hagiographa were implicitly given to Moses at Sinai. Beginnings of this method are seen in Esra ix. 11, where a law of the Pentateuch is cited as an ordinance of the Prophets. Mosaic law is not held to exclude post-Mosaic developments."||

(d) Our Lord's method of quotation does not decide the matter.

(a) His uniqueness is rightly based by apologists, *e.g.*, Dr. Hettinger,¶ upon this also, that, whereas even Socrates is often

* "Einleitung," *loc. cit.*, p. 283.

† "Gesch. d. bibl. Offenbarung," ed. 1876, p. 374; "Einleitung," p. 274; *Nineteenth Century*, Feb. 1884, p. 197; "C. de l'A. T.," p. 39; "Der Prediger," 1884, *passim*.

‡ Kaulen, *loc. cit.*, p. 281; Loisy, *loc. cit.*, pp. 18-21; "Adv. haer.," iii. c. 21, 22.

§ "De Vita Moysis," iii. 39; "Antiqu. Jud.," iv. 326; Ryle, "Philo and Holy Scripture," 1895, p. xxviii.

|| "Old Testament in Jewish Church," pp. 312, 313; Berachoth Bab., 5a; "Talmud Jer. Megilla," i. 5; [iv. 1.]

¶ "Apologie," ed. 1867, i. 2, p. 440.

busy with morally indifferent matters (see three cases in Dr. Xenophon's "Memorabilia," iii. 10), Christ's teaching remains exclusively occupied with matters of immediate moral and religious import. But that complicated problem, the precise authorship of the several Bible books, is no such matter. Hence His very greatness would lead Him to adopt the current literary attributions.

(β) His whole method was demonstrably one of minute conformity to all the habits of His time and people, where principle permitted. So with the *κράσπεδα*, the "hem of His garment," no doubt the four blue or white tassels worn by every strict Jew on the four corners of his cloak.* So with the *ἐν τῷ βύτῳ* = "in" or "at the bush," i.e., on occasion of the story of the bush. He is referring to this section by the title which, for purposes of reference, had been popularly associated with it, exactly as Philo does.†

(γ) He says in John vii. 22: "Moses gave you circumcision."

"Whether," says Miss Wedgwood, "the correction, 'not that it is of Moses, but the fathers,' be from the speaker or the writer, we have the name of Moses used, at a critical moment and in a serious argument addressed to Jews, as a mere type of the Jewish law." "A careful study of Christ's quotations will show that inspiration was to Him a heritage of the race, that its individual channels had as little importance as that of the cup filled at a running stream."‡

(e) In the New Testament the authorship of the Joannine Gospel and Epistles, and of the Epistles to the Hebrews, Jude and II. Peter has its difficulties.

But as to the first, the very learned, "advanced," indeed often reckless Paul de Lagarde writes :

I have long since convinced myself that the Fourth Gospel with the three Joannine Epistles are by the author of the Revelation of John, and that this author is no other than St. John the Apostle.§

Indeed "the certainty of Justin Martyr's knowledge of this gospel" || makes it necessary that it should have been written by

* Schanz, "Comment. über Mtt.," 1879, p. 276.

† *Ibid.*, p. 357. Ryle, *loc. cit.*, p. xxii.

‡ "The Message of Israel," 1894, pp. 48, 301.

§ "Deutsche Schriften," ed. 1886, p. 70.

|| So even Jülicher, "Einl. in das N. T.," 1894, p. 250.

St. John, or, at the least, put into final form and published at Ephesus, soon after his death, by an immediate disciple of his.

As to Hebrews, it need not be taken as fully Pauline. Origen says its thoughts are St. Paul's, "but God knows who wrote it"; St. Jerome, that many hold Barnabas or Clement to be its author, "but indeed it does not matter whose it is, since it is by some ecclesiastical author, and is honoured through daily reading by the Churches"; Estius (1613), that the matter and order are St. Paul's, the composition St. Clement's or rather St. Luke's; Dr. Kaulen, that St. Paul occasioned and sent, that one of his disciples, probably St. Clement, wrote it; Abbé Loisy, that "the attitude of the West towards Hebrews has but one plausible explanation: that the Roman Church, which knew the Epistle before 100 A.D., did not know it as by St. Paul, but another writer, not an Apostle. Was it Barnabas, as thought Tertullian?"* In any case, he was a Paulinising Jew-Christian of Alexandrian culture.

As to the closely allied, relatively unimportant, obscure little Epistles of Jude and II. Peter, the following three points appear to be secured. There is no serious difficulty about the authorship of Jude. Even the "advanced" Dr. von Soden admits:

That a younger "Brother" of Our Lord, whose missionary travels (1 Cor. ix. 5) may have led among Heathen-Christian circles, should have written this epistle at a late date, say 80-90 A.D., cannot reasonably be declared impossible.†

II. Peter is directly dependant upon St. Jude. The strict Catholics, Drs. Hundhausen and Kaulen declare: "It is hardly doubtful that the substance of the Epistle of St. Jude (vv. 3-18) is interwoven with the texture (i. 20-iii. 3) of II. Peter."‡ The question as to whether the writer be St. Peter himself, or one writing in his person, is but a question of fact. For if such impersonation be not incompatible with veracity and Inspiration in the case of Solomon in the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiastes, neither is it necessarily incompatible with either, here, in the case of St. Peter.

* "Eus. H. E.," vi. 25; "Epist. ad Dard.," No. 129; "In. Pauli Epp. Comment.," ed. 1843, v. vi. p. 12; "Einleitung," p. 544; "C. du N. T.," 1891, p. 277.

† "Hand-Komm. z. N. T.," iii. 1890, p. 166.

‡ Kaulen, *loc. cit.*, p. 566.

(5) Canonicity does not involve unity of authorship. This is clear, in the Old Testament, in the case of the Psalter, although held to be entirely by David, by SS. John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and others; and of Proverbs, although frequently ascribed by the Fathers to Solomon alone.* Two authors are admitted for Job, by Dr. Bickell and Abbé Loisy, who give Elihu's speech to a later author;† and for Isaiah, by at least four Catholic authorities.‡ “The Deutero-canonical fragments of Esther formed certainly no part of its first redaction; the same is probable in the case of Daniel; yet all these (eight) additions are sacred and canonical.” § Four authors, we have seen, are admitted by several Catholics for the Pentateuch, which would thus become for the Old Testament something like what Tatian's Diatessaron (165 A.D.?) would have been in the New Testament, had this Harmony been preserved alone, instead of the four Gospels separately.||

As to the New Testament, we have Catholic authorities admitting successive work in SS. Matthew and Luke.¶ For the passages, Mark xvi. 9-20, and John v. 4; vii. 53-viii. 11, omitted by all the great Uncials, we have the weighty opinions of Padre Vercellone: “The opinion is probable that up to the present the authenticity of these passages has not been defined;” and of Abbé Loisy:

We may consider it a point of faith that the evangelic fragments specially intended by Trent (*i.e.*, Mark xvi. 9-20, Luke xxii. 43, 44, John vii. 53-viii. 11) are canonical, the work of inspired authors, but it is not of faith that they are respectively by SS. Mark, Luke and John.**

(6) As to the Authenticity of the Latin Vulgate.

“Where,” says Dr. Kaulen, “it can be proved that a particular shorter or longer passage was not received from the first in the Vulgate, the rejection of its Scriptural Authenticity is compatible with the Tridentine Decree.”†† Hence, as to I. John v. 7, Fr. Cornely, S.J., tells us that

* Kaulen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 261, 269.

† “Buch Job,” 1894, pp. 12, 57; “Le Livre de Job,” 1892, pp. 22-44.

‡ DUBLIN REVIEW, April 1895, pp. 321, 322.

§ “C. du N. T.,” p. 263.

|| DUBLIN REVIEW, *loc. cit.*, pp. 320, 321.

¶ *Ibid.*, Oct. 1894, pp. 333-336.

** “Sulla Autenticità delle s. parti della Volgata,” 1866, p. 45; “C. du N. T.,” pp. 243, 244, 262, 263.

†† “Gesch. d. Vulgata,” 1868, p. 393.

"The whole question is only whether the Trinitarian argument from this verse is strictly Scriptural or Traditional," and leaves us free to accept or reject the Scriptural Authenticity.* Dr. Kaulen says: "The passage is to be viewed as a Commentary, venerable through its wide prevalence, on verse 8."† The same is the view of Professors Scholz, 1836; Bisping, 1871; Schanz-Aberle; Paulin Martin, 1889; Loisy, 1891.

2. And critics join hands with theologians in the following points:

(1) The reasonableness of a separate sacred literature, and the basing its claims on its coming from a previous special Revelation, and its leading to a subsequent special Interpretation.

Professor Robertson Smith says:

To say that God speaks to all men alike, without the use of a revealing agency, reduces religion to mysticism. There is a positive element in all religion, an element learnt from our predecessors. If what is so learnt is true, we must ultimately come back to a point in history when it was new truth, acquired by some particular man or men, who, not getting it from their predecessors, must have got it by personal revelation from God Himself.‡

And Professor Bruce:

"The Bible was to (the older Protestant) theologians not only the record of revelation, but revelation itself"; and yet just "in this respect is the Bible unique, that it is a literature which providentially grew up around a historical revelation of God in Israel."§

And Canon Gore concludes: "It is, we may perhaps say, becoming more and more difficult to believe in the Bible without believing in the Church."||

(2) The Deutero-canonical Books.

Professor Sanday says: "I confess that the Roman definitions on this head do not seem to be irreconcilable with fact and history, or to be such as need divide churches."¶

(3) The high purity of text still attainable in the New Testament.

See the nobly warm defence, chiefly with regard to St. Paul's main Epistles, by so "advanced" a critic as Dr. Kuenen;

* "Introd. in libros N. T.," 1886, pp. 669-681.

† "Einleitung," p. 36.

§ "Apologetics," pp. 300, 302.

¶ "Inspiration," 1893, p. 275.

‡ "O. T. in J. C.," pp. 11, 12.

|| "Lux Mundi," ed. 1891, p. 248.

the striking warnings of Dr. Jülicher ; and the testimony of such fearless textual critics as Drs. Westcott and Hort, who say, after years of closest labour at the New Testament text :

In the variety and fulness of the evidence on which it rests, the text of the New Testament stands absolutely, unapproachably alone among prose writings. . . . We cannot too strongly express our disbelief in the existence of undetected interpolations of any moment. . . . The New Testament books, as preserved in extant documents, assuredly speak to us, in every important respect, in language identical with that in which they spoke to those for whom they were first written.*

IV.

The second doctrine, Inspiration, lands us in full transcendence. "Inspiration," says Professor Schell, "is, by its very nature, a transcendental mystery, cognisable by Revelation alone."†

1. The discriminations of theologians are as follows :

(1) Inspiration and Theism.

"Inspiration," writes Professor Schell, "is understandable only by means of a full and deep apprehension of the theistic conception of God, as an infinite Power enclosing, bearing, exciting all finite being and action, and this by being itself effective, not by renouncing its own effectiveness. God always acts as strengthening and awakening from within, whenever He vouchsafes new objects of thought and of aim from above."‡

(2) Inspiration is omnipresent.

"Inspiration, then, does not formally signify a shifting in the relations between the divine and the human causality to the disadvantage of the latter, but a heightening both of the divine influence and of the human spontaneous activity. Materially, it extends as far as the human authorship, including the will, the plan or thoughts, and the execution or words ; for these three activities are not only synchronous but conditional, and influence each other mutually, so that no one or no two of them would suffice as the sole vehicle of Inspiration. In all limiting schemes the spontaneous share of the sacred writer falls short of the origination of other writers, whilst God on His part does not fully speak to us.§

* "Ges. Abhandlungen," pp. 330-369 ; "Einleitung," pp. 401, 402 ; "The New Testament in Greek ;" Introd., pp. 278, 281, 284.

† "Dogmatik," i. p. 112.

‡ *Ibid*, p. 100.

§ "Dogmatik," pp. 103, 104.

"The error consists," writes Padre Semeria, "in putting the question thus: 'Are the words inspired?' The book is inspired: the book is, so to say, a multiple production, like the construction of a house. To ask whether the action which terminates in the whole does not act equally upon the parts is absurd; we might as well ask whether the architect of the house has built the bricks."*

"The whole inspired book," urges Abbé Loisy, "is the joint work of God and of man: of God as principal, of man as subordinate author."†

(3) Inspiration and consciousness.

"The inspiration of the will to write," says Dr. Schell, "stands above and acts through the factors which usually occasion literary labours, by either creating or simply using the appropriate circumstances."‡ "The sacred writers," says Dr. Dausch, "could be conscious or not of (the inspirational character of) their impulse to write. The prophets were often directly ordered to write down their visions; but who would assume for the apostles, for St. Luke, a conscious special impulse? Was not the general order of Christ to proclaim His Gospel sufficient?"§

But in every case the writer would remain thoroughly conscious of what he was writing.

"The only proper idea of Inspiration," writes Fr. Clarke, "is that God used His instruments as men, preserving their human faculties so that they knew and understood what they were saying and had said."||

(4) Inspiration is distinct from Revelation.

The Council of the Vatican defines that

The Church holds the Scriptural books as sacred and canonical not only because they contain Revelation without error, but because, having been written under the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author.¶

They *contain* Revelation; they *are* inspired and Word of God.

"Revelation and scriptural Inspiration," writes Dr. Dausch, "are essentially different; even in the case of the prophets, revelation must have preceded registration both in time and logic. The Apostles, again, did not surely require special revelations with a view to writing. And would

* *Revue Biblique*, "Chronique d'Italie," Avril 1893.

† "Études Bibliques," p. 69.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 105.

§ "Die Schriftinspiration," 1891, p. 240.

|| *Tablet*, May 5, 1894, p. 682.

¶ Denzinger, *loc. cit.*, No. 1636.

[No. 16 of *Fourth Series*.]

it not suffice for the Psalmist that his canticles should have issued from his heart habitually steeped in the Spirit of God?" *

(5) Inspiration and Truth.

Inspiration everywhere effects and guarantees at least a relative and economic truth, such a minimum of adaptation to the scientific persuasions and historical standards and methods of the time and place, as was necessary if the Divine Message was to be not only true but understandable, not only Word of God, but Word of God through particular men to particular men.

"By the relative side of the Bible," writes Abbé Loisy, "Revelation was proportioned to the requirements of the times in which it appeared. This was a necessity, and this necessity could not but become an imperfection in the course of ages, when the progress of the sciences should have transformed astronomy, cosmology, the natural sciences, and even the secular history of humanity." But "the perpetual *magisterium* of the Church is there, to discern for us infallibly, under the ancient form which was its vehicle, the ever new truth contained in Scripture." †

And these ready-found relativities, the necessary starting-points and vehicles for the imparting of new, supernatural truth, were, even taken in themselves, never simply, formally erroneous. ‡ This I shall now attempt to show.

(a) "The sacred writers," says the Encyclical, "described and dealt with the things of the visible universe in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, or put down what God, speaking to men, signified, in the way men could understand and were accustomed to." And this because "they did not intend to teach men the

* "Die Schriftinspiration," 1891, p. 240.

† "Ét. Bibl.," pp. 70, 71.

‡ The Encyclical says, indeed, "There are those who wrongly think that, *in a question of the truth or falsehood of a passage*, we should consider not so much what God has said as the reason and purpose which He had in mind in saying it." But a little earlier it tells us that "to understand how just" is a rule just quoted from St. Augustine with regard to apparent conflicts between Scripture and Science, "we must remember first that the Holy Ghost who spoke by the sacred writers did not intend to teach men those things (*i.e.*, the essential nature of the things of the visible universe), things in no way profitable unto salvation." Now these two passages are contradictory, unless we take the italicised words as a limiting clause, and understand the first passage, not to forbid us "to consider the reason and purpose which God had in mind in what He has said" (for this is precisely what is done, for all natural science, in the second passage), but only to forbid us doing so with a view to declaring any passage either non-inspired or, though inspired, false.

essential nature of the things of the visible universe, things in no way profitable unto salvation." * Now it is simply throughout Scripture that by universal consent† the Inspirer thinks, and the writer writes *and thinks and understands what he writes*. Hence it follows that even when there is no intention to teach, the writer must have thought something. And since, in all cases of science, these thoughts are but pre-existent persuasions, unconscious of any alternative, never formal exclusive convictions, and there is no kind of intention to teach or systematise, the devout reader and the dogmatic theologian can entirely neglect these accessory thoughts, and yet attain the full object and formal teaching of the Bible. Still these persuasions are there, and subserve the same purpose as æther to light, atmosphere to sound, pigments to painting: they are the ready-found vehicles of Revelation, the runner who brings home the message. The theologian studies exclusively the light and the sound, the painting and the message; but the scholar, reconstructor of the whole mental environment and furniture of the past, cannot ignore the humble existence or character of this æther and atmosphere, these pigments, this runner. Since "no instruction concerning secular matters transcending the intellectual horizon of the times of composition can be expected";‡ since, in quasi-scientific passages when we find them in fault "the writers did not err, because they had no formal intention of teaching as true what we find incorrect,"§ it follows that we should be prepared for the traces of such persuasions in cases such as the immovableness of the earth, the shortness of the periods of Creation, the universality of the Flood. As to the first, Abbé Loisy tells us: "From one end of Scripture to the other the earth is supposed to be really immovable under the dome of the heavens"; as to the second, Fr. von Hummelauer, S.J., says: "The Scriptural text of Genesis i., according to its literal sense, speaks exclusively of six ordinary days of twenty-four hours each"; as to the third, see the same writer's very friendly account of the many approved Catholics who now

* *Tablet*, Jan. 6, 1894, p. 10a.

† *E.g.*, Padre Brandi, "La Questione Biblica," 1894, pp. 21, 22.

‡ Schanz, "Theol. Quart.-Schrift," 1895, p. 182.

§ Loisy, *loc. cit.*, p. 92.

teach an even ethnographically limited Deluge.* Yet, in the first case, Scripture is but teaching the glory and immovableness of the Eternal; in the second, the grand order and successiveness, the freedom and goodness of Creation; in the third, not an exact history, but the moral lesson of the divine estimate and punishment of sin.

(b) "The principles," says the Encyclical, "here laid down" (with respect to natural science), "will apply to cognate sciences, and especially to history."†

"By cognate sciences," says Fr. Clarke, "are intended sciences cognate with physical sciences, *i.e.*, sciences whose conclusions are not *per se* theological, though they may be put to religious uses." For "Revelation is doctrine given by historical events, *e.g.*, the Resurrection, and in that case, as in the Bible history generally, the teaching of history is the teaching of doctrine."‡

"The Encyclical," writes Fr. Lucas, S.J., "nowhere determines which of the Old Testament Books are historical; but only lays it down, as I understand its teachings, that those books or parts of books which claim to be truly historical are historically true."§

"This is of importance," adds Dr. Schanz, "for whole books and the whole method of ancient, hence also sacred, historiography. When the sacred writers do not claim to write history or to write it as demanded by modern criticism, they cannot be accused of error, if the representation does not completely correspond to the standard of severely historical science."||

"The aim," writes Abbé Loisy, "pursued by the writers to whom we owe the general narratives of the beginning of Genesis, was one of religious and moral instruction. All the historical interpretations of the narrative are but so many hypotheses, to be classified according to their degree of probability. The (religious and) moral signification is the only point absolutely outside discussion, because it is the only point which the authors really intended to treat."¶

Cardinal Meignan agrees :

The aim of the inspired author to whom we owe the preservation and redaction of the narratives of Genesis i.-xi. is, primarily, religious and moral instruction. One never succeeds in building more than varyingly probable hypotheses upon the details of the narrative; only (the religious

* Loisy, *loc. cit.*, p. 92; "Comm. in Genesim," 1895, pp. 65; 223-256. He adopts the vision-theory for the cosmogony, a theory which does no violence to the text, but is nowhere suggested by it. The ideal interpretation, as advocated by P. Semeria in the *Revue Biblique*, 1894, avoids both drawbacks.

† *Tablet*, *loc. cit.*, p. 106.

‡ *Ibid.*, April 28, 1894, p. 642.

§ *Month*, June 1894, p. 154.

|| *Loc. cit.* p. 188.

¶ "Ét. Bibl.," pp. 27-29.

and) moral signification remains always outside discussion, because it is the only point which the writer had in view.*

"In Chronicles," declares Professor Schanz, "many differences of dates and facts could be adduced, which are explicable in part from the aim of the book, in great part only from the use of different sources."†

As to the aim of the Redactor :

"The critics," says Dom Howlett, "declare that Chronicles, Tobit, Esther, Judith, Jonas, are instances of Jewish *Haggadah*, or narratives intended to convey some moral lesson, not strictly historical, but founded upon history. That, in the abstract, such books might exist in the Bible, there is no reason to deny." Father Cornely, Dr. Dereser, and Drs. Jahn, Movers, Scholz, are referred to as holding some such views with regard to the first, second and fourth book respectively.‡

As to the character of his sources :

"Many things," says St. Jerome, "are said in Scripture according to the opinion of the times to which the events (*gesta*) are referred, and not according to the objective reality (*rei veritas*)."§

Abbé Loisy sums up :

All the books and the different parts of each book of the Old Testament have not the same historical character, and all the Biblical books were drawn up according to processes freer than those of modern historiography.||

2. The admissions of the critics are as follows :

(1) The truthfulness of Scripture :

"No doubt," says Dr. Kuenen, "we find a particular pragmatic aim in many Biblical narratives ; but we must carefully guard against representing it as purely arbitrary. If the writer puts facts in a particular light, he no doubt does so *in order that* others may see them in the same light, but still first of all *because* he himself so sees them. As a matter of fact, the Biblical writers saw persons and things in the same light as that in which they present them to us."¶

(2) The scientific value of the Biblical Cosmogony :

"Among all ancient theories," says Dr. Dillmann, "the Biblical narrative approaches most nearly to the results of physical science."***

"It presents us," writes Dr. Driver, "with a series of representative pictures remarkably suggestive of the (scientific) reality, if only they be not treated as 'a revelation of it.'"††

* "L'A. Testament dans s. rapports avec le N.," 1895, p. 101.

† *Loc. cit.*, p. 191.

‡ DUBLIN REVIEW, July 1894, pp. 77, 93.

§ "In Jerem.," c. 23.

|| *Loc. cit.*, p. 80.

¶ "Ges. Abh.," p. 38.

** "Genesis," ed. 1886, p. 11.

†† *Expositor*, Jan. 1886, p. 41.

(3) Scripture unique among all sacred books.

Professor Max Müller, of singular competence and enthusiasm as to the latter, confesses :

The pioneer workers in the sacred Oriental literature have raised expectations that cannot be fulfilled, fears also that are unfounded—Try and imagine what the Old Testament would have been if it had not been kept distinct from the Talmud, or the New Testament if it had been mixed up with the spurious gospels, and the records of the wranglings of the early Councils, if you would understand, to some extent, the wild confusion of sublime truth with vulgar stupidity that meets us in the Veda, the Avesta, and the Tripitaka.” *

V.

The third doctrine, Revelation, brings us at last to the real *raison d'être* of the Bible and of the Church.

1. Theologians distinguish as follows :

(1) All Revelation foreshadows or reflects the Incarnation, and shares in its touching condescension, economy and adaptation to our needs. Nowhere is it a monologue of the Absolute Mind, but everywhere a message from the Absolute Mind, through a finite mind to finite minds.

“The connection,” writes Father Clarke, “of the faith and morals with history, science, and so on, is so close that, however a theologian or theological school may begin, the end uniformly is that either the principle of reserve, which is that of the Encyclical, or the principle of mistakes, which is that of the partial inspiration theory, is applied to both alike.” †

“The truths of Faith and Morals, the special object of Revelation,” says Abbé Loisv. “appear in the Scriptures such as the Biblical writers were capable of apprehending them.” ‡

The truth, then, as revealed to us is not only *quantitatively* different from the truth as it is in God, but is also *qualitatively* adapted to our apprehension, whilst ever retaining the unique life-giving quality drawn from the Author of Life and Truth. As a Roman child was laid, new-born, at its father's feet, and only if he himself lifted it up was allowed to live ; as a mother's milk is uniquely adapted to her child, just because, though of

* “Sacred Books of the East,” v. i., 1879, pp. x., xv.

† *Contemporary Review*, July 1894, p. 53.

‡ *Loc. cit.*, p. 94.

her very essence, it is not identical with either the whole of her person or any other single part of her; so also with man: inconceivable creation must be followed by unutterable condescension, absolute truth must bend down and be proportioned to his needs, if he is to rise and to approach God, and is to grow into the image of His likeness.

(2) Hence, Revelation has a development.

Vincent of Lerins wrote, in 434 A.D., of the purely subjective development of doctrine in the Christian Church :

Is there no progress in the Church of Christ? Indeed there is, a very great one. Let the religion of souls imitate the growth of bodies; there is a great difference between blooming youth and mature old age; yet the very same individuals become old men who were youths.*

As to the objective development of doctrine in the Bible, Abbé Loisy tells us :

The ancient ages had such lights as sufficed for their needs. The Christian Revelation existed in germ before expanding fully at the coming of Our Lord. Neither should the theologian deny the existence of such a progress, nor the critic its legitimacy.

Now "this development of Biblical religious doctrine is shown in all its constituents: notion of God, the human destiny, the moral laws."†

(a) As to the nature of God :

"The Old Testament, *e.g.*, Job, attributes all phenomena directly to God. Our distinctions of orders, physical and moral, natural and supernatural, are absent. There is but one only order, the divine order of the universe. God marshals the clouds, the wind, the rain, the snow and hail. Storms, above all, are a kind of theophany."

And as to moral temptation :

"The accomplishment of Providential decrees, the language of the Old and even of the New Testament does not distinguish between the direct volitions and the simple permissions of God. From the point of view of the will of Providence, all appears as necessary, *e.g.*, the hardening of the Jewish people's heart takes place by a sort of divine necessity without suppressing human responsibility."‡

* "Common," cc. xxviii., xxix.

† *Loc. cit.*, pp. 80, 85.

‡ "Job," p. 69; "Evangiles Synoptiques," 1894, p. 298.

(b) As to the human destiny, Bishop Mignot tells us :

The ancient Jews had no very precise conceptions as to the immortality of the soul, eternal rewards or punishments; all was somewhat confused in their belief as to survival.*

Abbé Vigouroux says :

The Psalmist, as all the other pre-exilic Biblical writers, is silent as to future rewards, or at least does not speak of them clearly.†

And Abbé Loisy :

Job does not find his moral sanction in the alternatives beyond the grave; like the authors of Proverbs he has no idea of them, or at least does not dwell on them; he finds it in his unshaken faith in the justice of God. Death is not annihilation for the Hebrew sages; but man's continued existence is conceived only in the vaguest manner, and has a diminished, shadowy life, and his idea of retribution is not directly attached to it. They are all pre-occupied with the greatness of God and the nothingness of man."‡

(c) As to the Moral Laws :

"Divorce was permitted by the Mosaic Law (Deut. xxiv. 1). The husband could dismiss the wife for 'something shocking,' being bound only to give her a written attestation of separation: she was then free to re-marry. Jesus condemns divorce absolutely (Mat. v. 32, Mark x. 8-12). The *lex talionis* 'an eye for an eye' (Ex. xxi. 24) is a penal law founded on a principle of rigorous justice applied to an elementary social stage. The judge only was charged with its execution. Jesus views it as a moral law, and its execution in the substitution of all-suffering charity for claimful justice."§

(3) In the Imprecatory Psalms, "the Speaker," says Dr. Cheyne, "can be shown, in most cases, to be" not a private individual thirsting for private revenge, but "the Church or a typical pious Israelite" calling upon the Judge of all the earth to reveal His justice by deciding between His friends and His enemies.|| Yet we cannot but say with Bishop Haneberg: "These Psalms seem clearly to belong to such antiquities as can never grow new."¶

* Vigouroux, "Dict. de la Bible," v. i., 1894, p. xxi.

† "Livres Saints et la Critique," vol. v. p. 56.

‡ "Job," pp. 85, 86.

§ "Synoptiques," pp. 194, 198.

|| "Origin of Psalter," 1891, p. 258.

¶ "Gesch. d. bibl. Offenbarung," ed. 1876, p. 356.

The story of Jael and Sisera, the Books of Esther and Judith, require and admit analogous explanations and allowances.

Canticles is increasingly held to be a rudimentary drama, with three chief personages (King, Shepherd, Shepherdess), a view accepted as possible by Bishop Haneberg; * and hence as having, even in its literal sense, a high ethical object. Now "there exists," says Padre Semeria, "a Catholic School, as orthodox as the allegorical, which admits here a literal human sense and a divine typical sense" or intention: "faith assures us of the latter, it suffices that science should find nothing to oppose to it."† And this condition is fulfilled, for even the most "advanced" critics, from Herder (1778) to Cornill (1891), admire, "notwithstanding its Oriental taste, the deeply moral character of this unique book."‡ "The typical interpretation," says Dr. Driver, "is perfectly compatible with the literal sense."§ Fr. Gietman, S.J. (1891), has to place his allegorical interpretation within a narrow compass.

As to Ecclesiastes, the difficulties of its apparent teaching have by no one been more forcibly put than by Bishop Haneberg.¶ They are best met, if we admit: (1) that it was written in times of terrible anarchy and decay, about 200 B.C., and that it is "upon life not absolutely, but as he witnessed it, that the writing passes sentence;" and (2) that he stands between the pre-exilic period when the individual found his end in membership with his God-loved free nation, and the Christian dispensation with its clear, constant doctrine of the fuller life beyond the grave; and that hence, as the Ceremonial Law according to St. Paul, so this book also helps demonstrate the insufficiency of that covenant which was then "decaying and near its end" (Heb. viii. 13).¶

2. And even the most "advanced" of the serious critics increasingly admit the unique character or degree of the Bible's perception of religious and moral truth.

See Kuenen's severe castigation of Renan's presentation of the God of the Old Testament—*e.g.*, "his description of the

* *Loc. cit.*, pp. 375, 376.

‡ Cornill's "Einleitung," p. 237.

§ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 370-372.

¶ See Driver, *loc. cit.*, p. 442; Nowack, "Der Prediger," 1883, p. 204.

† *Revue Bibl.*, *loc. cit.*

§ "Introduction," ed. 1892, p. 424.

nature and character of Jehovah is exaggerated and one-sided ; that of the so-called Elohim is pure imagination.”*

See Wellhausen’s incidental remarks—*e.g.*,

“ Among all ancient peoples there is a relation between the Deity and national affairs, the utilisation of religion as a mainspring for law and custom ; in no other people in such purity and strength as among the Jews.” “ Not through entrails or the flight of birds, but through men he spoke to men : that is the precise conception of Revelation—the mysterious relation between the divinity and the human spirit, which attains its fulness and becomes articulate in individual elect souls.” “ The highest flight of this divine spirit (of union with God) is to be found in Psalm lxiii. 23–26. Here the lost life is refound in a higher life, without the expression of any expectation of a beyond ; against death and devil the interior certainty of communion with God gets thrown into the scales. That is, of course, a degree of religion too high to appeal to the many.” “ Even the post-exilic Jews refused to part with the large-heartedness and rationality which is at the core of moral Theism ; even the Priestly Code puts forward the pre-Mosaic Patriarch Abraham as the finest pattern of devotion, and hence is well aware of a piety independent of the Ceremonial Law.” “ It is a marvel how for the Jews their God remained the most living personality. They were penetrated by and convinced of their religion in quite a different way than ever were the Greeks of their philosophy.”†

See, finally, Mr. Montifiore, who delights in Professor Sanday’s “ Inspiration ” as a reminder to the Old Testament critics “ of the limits of their tether and their province, and (if they need it) of the wonderful and unique character of the writings which they dissect ; ” and who says :

So far as I have read the religious literature of other races, the words of the writers of the Bible seem to me to exceed the words of other great (and as I believe inspired) teachers in “ fulness, power, and purity.” Even Plato does not bring out the loving-kindness of God. I agree with Dr. Sanday when he says : ‘ On the greatest points of all, those which relate to the divine character and attributes, the Bible is not only supreme but unique. The believer in the Bible has no need to exaggerate, he has but to state the facts as they really are.’‡

VI.

And now these poor sketches are ended, with their perhaps, alas, bewildering analysis of the mere phenomena of those

* *Loc. cit.*, pp. 431–440.

† “ *Isr. u. Jüd. Geschichte*,” 1894, pp. 71, 69, 178, 180, 182.

‡ *Jewish Quarterly*, 1894, pp. 587, 588, 594.

sacred writings which lie for ever in the lap of our great mother, the Catholic Church. Such studies cannot reach, do not claim to attain the spiritual truth of Scripture, reserved for humble purity of heart, and the true teacher of us all. They can but help precisionise the successive whens and wheres, the secondary whys and hows of the apparition, throughout fourteen centuries and more, of God's condescensions to us creatures here in time and space, and to remove obstacles out of the way of upward-moving souls. For hopeful symptoms are abroad of a return and an advance to Theism, to Christianity, to the Church's fully transcendent life. Let men but give the Church a fair trial by action, and they will find in her the "justification, against a vain and temerarious science, of the noble folly of living, and, if need be, dying, to save one's soul."* But previous, carefully courageous discrimination will, on our part, be wanted, in view of such a cry as "the Bankruptcy of Science"—a cry so true and hopeful with respect to the claims of its over-eager votaries to have reached the reality of anything, or to have supplied life with one single sufficient motive for action; so dangerously excessive a reaction, if applied to the undoubted achievements of the sciences, each within its own domain, which are renewing the face of the earth and the phenomena of history.

And the conception of Scripture which, if thus occasioned, is really caused by the Church's own secular positions, fits in well with all we have each of us experienced of God's dealings within us and without. I look within me, and I see how God has ever used the old surface-knowledge which He found there, as a starting-point, frame and vehicle for my apprehension of the new deeper light and love that He was giving me; and this in proportion as He had made me fit to "bear" some of the "many things" which He had "to tell" me. I look up at Him, throning on our altars, and I see a condescension too great for any one but Him alone. I look around me, a mere unit among my fellows, that "greater part which must be content to be as though they had not been, to be found in the register of God, not in the record of man," and I realise that it was from the midst of such a crowd that an obscure woman was

* Blondel's "l'Action," 1893, p. 490.

moved to bless "the womb that bore Him and the breasts that gave Him suck;" that it was to this one among the world-forgotten many that He revealed the "Still more blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it," as His hidden mother had done so perfectly throughout the silent years. And so I am ready for the Church's Bible, and its having taken men successively as it found them, inerrantly using their existent sublunar persuasions as the vehicles of supernatural truth; for its divinely deep condescension; and for its being the ever-growing manifestation of an inexhaustible Person, as test and food and reward of poverty of spirit and purity of heart. Only through what I may keep and gain in common with the truly humblest of my fellows, can my soul's ear be won to the divine harmonies of the Spirit in Scripture, and of that "God-gifted organ-voice" of all men, the testimony, teaching and authority of the Catholic Church.

FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL.

ART. IV.—PASTOR'S HISTORY OF THE POPES.

1. *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Mit Benutzung des päpstlichen Geheim-Archives und vieler anderer Archive bearbeitet von DR. LUDWIG PASTOR. Zweiter Band: Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance von der Thronbesteigung Pius' II. bis zum Tode Sixtus' IV. Zweite Auflage. Freiburg: Herder. 1894.*
2. *The History of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages. Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and other Original Sources. From the German of Dr. LUDWIG PASTOR, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Edited by FREDERICK IGNATIUS ANTROBUS, of the Oratory. Vols. III. and IV. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1894.*

THE sale of the first two volumes of the English translation of Pastor's History of the Popes has been so successful that Father Antrobus has been encouraged to bring out two other volumes, thus completing all that portion already written by Dr. Pastor. Though a certain degree of uniformity has been preserved, the reader will note with satisfaction that the new instalment presents a far better appearance than its predecessor. Moreover, he will find that the blemishes which detracted from the perfection of the earlier volumes have been, as a rule, carefully guarded against in those which now lie before us. He will, however, regret that Dr. Pastor's divisions and numbering have not been retained; and though the Table of Contents in the English version is an excellent one, it is rather an original composition than a translation. But let us say, once for all, that Father Antrobus and his colleagues have done their work admirably.

Of Dr. Pastor's characteristics as a historian something was said in a former number of this Review [July 1892]. The present volumes tend to confirm the estimate there given. They display the same indefatigable search after truth, the

same plain-speaking about the defects of those in high places. So, too, they contain few brilliant pictures, little insight into character, and hardly any wide surveys of the course of events. The present writer is aware that he is expressing an opinion which will be controverted in some quarters. A history, we are often told, should not be a romance or a philosophical treatise. It has to deal with truth—the whole truth and nothing but the truth—and it should leave to the novelist all straining after “effect” and to the scientist all attempts to discover “laws.” This view, though commonly accepted in Germany and to a less extent in England, is surely not the true one. History, like any other branch of study, should serve “for delight, for ornament, and for ability.” A bare presentation of facts will attain none of these purposes. Nevertheless, no writer can henceforth deal with the period embraced by Dr. Pastor without consulting these volumes; and the more they are studied the higher will be the estimate formed of the industry, the learning, and the honesty of their author.

At the death of Calixtus III. (1458) the Papal Restoration seemed to be complete. The anti-Popes had died in obscurity; disputed elections were heard of no more; Germany and Spain, England and France, all agreed in acknowledging one Pontiff as Head of the Church. The conciliar party had been defeated, and all opposition from the East was at an end since the downfall of Constantinople. The revival of learning, which at first had threatened to be a revival of paganism, had been christianized by having a Pope as its most munificent patron. The Turks, though they had gained possession of the capital of the East, had found in the sturdy Hungarians and Albanians far tougher foes than the effete and degenerate Greeks. Still, much remained to be accomplished, and signs were not wanting of yet greater difficulties in the not distant future. The conciliar party had been defeated, but only for the moment. They still clamoured loudly for reform in head and members. Serious dangers, too, were to be apprehended from the Cardinals, who were more than ever bent on curtailing the papal prerogatives and turning the government of the Church into an oligarchy consisting of themselves. Civil war in England and the struggle with the Moors in Spain deprived both of these powers of any external influence; but France

was hankering after a renewal of the Avignon vassalage, while Germany threatened heresy in addition to schism. Italy, hopelessly at variance with itself, proved a greater trial to the Popes than the countries beyond the Alps. The alliance between the Papacy and the Renaissance had been the means of introducing dangerous and unworthy elements into the Church. The Turks, though they had been checked at Belgrade, were now consolidating their conquests and making ready for fresh advances. Such was the position of the Papacy at the opening of the period which we are now about to study. We must bear in mind throughout that our subject is the history, not of the Church, but of the Popes. Though the interests of the head and the members may be the same, their activities necessarily differ. Hence we are to confine our attention to those transactions in which the Popes directly played a part. And we shall note, too, what has already attracted our attention, that each pontificate has a character of its own. There is, of course, a certain continuity, a certain sameness, between a Pope and his predecessors and his successors; but there are also, at times, marked differences. To go no further than the former volumes, no one can have failed to be struck with the change from the stern, ascetic Eugenius to the scholarly and artistic Nicholas, and from him again to the fiery old warrior, Calixtus.

The conclave which ensued at the death of Calixtus III. was short. Capranica, who beyond doubt was the fittest for the tiara, was unfortunately carried off by fever just before the assembling of the cardinals. The French party endeavoured to secure the election of D'Estouteville, but in spite of their efforts the requisite majority of votes were speedily given to Piccolomini, who took the title of Pius II. (August 19, 1458).

Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, a scion of a noble but impoverished family, was born at Corsignano, near Siena, in the year 1405. He was bred to the law, but soon forsook his professional studies to devote himself with ardour to the classics. In his twenty-seventh year his ability attracted the attention of Cardinal Capranica, who carried him away to the Council of Basle. There the young Humanist became a violent opponent of the Papal party; and when his patron became reconciled with Eugenius IV. he transferred his ser-

vices to Cardinal Albergati. He was then (1438) sent on a secret mission to Scotland and England, where he encountered many romantic and dangerous adventures.* On his return to Basle he divided his time between opposition to the Pope and the society of a circle of friends, like himself, of studious habits and lax morals. It must be borne in mind that at this time he was not an ecclesiastic, and that he frankly admitted his unfitness for so high a calling.† His letters and his writings, notably a short story in Boccaccio's style, betray the most shameless immorality. But as he drew near to middle life a great change came over his opinions and his character. The party to which he belonged was daily losing ground. His patron, the anti-Pope, Felix V., had not the smallest chance of supplanting the legitimate Pontiff. Taking advantage of Frederick III.'s visit to Basle, Æneas Sylvius joined his service and went with him to Austria (1442). Three years later he was actually sent to Rome to make arrangements with Eugenius for the holding of a council. The meeting between the Pope and his antagonist promised to be a stormy one, but the envoy won over Eugenius by a speech of consummate skill.‡ A year later he became a priest (1446), and henceforth was a staunch supporter of the Papal cause. So complete a conversion has naturally called forth the most diverse judgments on the part of historians. Some have seen in it nothing but the worldly wisdom of a partisan quitting the losing side and throwing in his lot with the victors. But the fact that Æneas Sylvius not only changed sides but also began to lead a decorous and even devout life, shows that the step which he took was not influenced merely by unworthy motives. At any rate he soon gave proof of his devotion to the Holy See. The opposition of the German princes had long been a source of anxiety to Eugenius IV. Æneas Sylvius returned to Germany and succeeded first in breaking up the League of the Electors, and then in inducing them to send a conciliatory embassy with him to Rome. Under Nicholas V. he was frequently employed

* A most interesting account of these is given in his "Commentaries," the substance of which may be seen in Dr. Creighton's "History of the Papacy," vol. ii. book iv.

† "Timeo enim continentiam" he wrote to one of his friends.

‡ Pastor, vol. i. p. 345.

in diplomatic missions, but his services met with no great reward. His cardinal's hat was bestowed upon him, not by that enlightened patron of the Renaissance, but, strangely enough, by the warrior-Pontiff, Calixtus III.

Truly, Pius II. was the very personification of the Renaissance. Pagan, anti-Papal, immoral as he had been, he became, without relinquishing his love of letters, one of the most honoured occupants of the Holy See. The Humanists hailed his accession with delight, for they expected the return of the golden age of Nicholas V.; but the new Pontiff was too much of an author himself to play the part of a mere Maecenas. He continued to labour at his magnificent work, "A Geographical and Ethnographical Description of the whole of the known World, with historical illustrations," in which he displays great elevation of thought, acute observation, and a knowledge of the influence of geography on history, far in advance of his age. In his preface he apologises for the fact that a Pope should have any time to devote to literature.

Our time has not been taken from our duties, but we have robbed our old age of its rest that we might hand down to posterity all that we know to be memorable. We have given to writing the hours due to sleep. Some will say that we might have spent our vigils better. We know that many of our predecessors made better use of their leisure; but ours is not unfruitfully employed, for knowledge begets prudence, and prudence is the guide of life.*

But the work by which he is best known is his *Memoirs*. All through his eventful life it was his wont to make notes of all that befell him, all that he had seen, and all that he learned from others. The first book, which contains the story of his life before his Pontificate, is the only portion which is more than a rough draft; the remainder is composed of fragments arbitrarily pieced together. Though it naturally represents its author in the best light in the various transactions of his career it is nevertheless recognised as a high authority for the history of his times.

In his "Commentaries" (says Dr. Creighton, vol. ii. p. 489) we have the best literary work of Æneas. The study of history was to him the source of instruction in life, the basis for the formation of his character.

* See Creighton, vol. ii. p. 488.

He looked upon events with reference to their results in the future, and his actions were regulated by a strong sense of historical proportion. Similarly, the present was to him always the product of the past, and he shaped his motives by reference to historical antecedents. It was probably this historical point of view which made him engage in so many schemes, because he felt that, when once affairs were in movement, the skilful statesman might be able to reap some permanent advantage. He was not willing to let slip any opportunity which might afford an opening for his political dexterity. Had he been less of a student, had his mind been less fertile, he might have concentrated his energies more successfully on one supreme object.

His enemies lost no opportunity of dragging his early licentious writings into light. Pius sadly recognised that he could neither disavow nor suppress them. *Semel emissum volat irrevocabile verbum*. He could only, like another Augustine, retract what he had written. "Follow what we now say," he writes, "believe the old man rather than the youth; esteem not the layman higher than the Pope; cast away Æneas, hold fast to Pius; the gentile name was given us by our parents at our birth, the Christian name we took on our Pontificate." This is surely a sufficient answer to all the cavils which still are repeated against him by the enemies of the Church. Had he continued his former irregularities, had he gloried in his shameful writings, he would have deserved our severest reprobation. But to charge the penitent Pius with the misdeeds of the profligate Æneas is most unjust and unreasonable.

The great aim of Pius' pontificate was to deliver the East from the Turks. No sooner was he crowned than he invited all Christian kings and princes to meet him in congress at Mantua. He himself set out from Rome in January 1459. And here it may be remarked that few Popes have been such great travellers as Pius. His geographical writings were no mere compilations, but were in many parts the result of his own observations. He had a keen eye for beautiful or striking scenery, and hence his works abound in admirable descriptions.* When he reached his destination he found that none of those who had been invited had yet appeared. In truth, the Christian

* An account of Pius' progress through the various Italian cities may be seen in Pastor, vol. iii. p. 47 *seq.*

sovereigns were much more bent on their own aggrandisement than on beating off the advance of the Turk. The Emperor Frederick, on whom the brunt of the defence should have fallen, had taken advantage of the misfortunes of Matthias Corvinus to get himself declared King of Hungary. The other German princes also held aloof. Charles VII. of France was incensed with Pius for recognising Ferrante as King of Naples in opposition to the Angevin claimant. It was not until September that the arrival of some of the Italian princes and embassies from Corvinus and the Duke of Burgundy enabled the Pope to open the Congress. Pius himself delivered a lengthy and eloquent address, in which he described in touching terms the miseries of the conquered countries and bewailed the indifference of the western nations to their fate.* Later on, the representatives of France and Germany arrived, but they showed little enthusiasm for the crusade. All agreed that war should be undertaken against the Turks, but there was the greatest diversity of opinion as to the means of prosecuting the war. The Venetians especially distinguished themselves by the urgency of their demands both for leadership and for money. Pius lamented his own inability to take personal part in the campaign. "Oh, had we but the youthful vigour of our former days† you should not have gone without us into battle or into danger. We ourselves would bear the Cross of Our Lord; we would uphold the banner of Christ against the Infidel, and would think ourselves happy if it were given to us to die for the Faith." A decree was passed ordering all ecclesiastics to contribute a tithe of their revenues, all the laity a thirtieth, and the Jews a twentieth. Meanwhile the terrible Mahomet II. was steadily annexing the yet unconquered portions of the Balkan peninsula. In the north Servia was seized, while in the south he overran the Morea. Then in the far east, Sinope and Trebizond, the relics of the old Eastern Empire, fell into his hands. A powerful fleet sailed over the Ægean Sea and took possession of nearly the whole of the Archipelago. Finally, the Sultan led a mighty host of 150,000 men into Bosnia. Bobovatz, the bulwark of

* Pastor, vol. iii. p. 79 *seq.*

† "O si quæ fuerant, juvenili in corpore vires," *Æn.*, v. 475.

the country, was at once treacherously surrendered to him, and Corvinus himself was starved into submission. Never was the Christian cause in a worse plight, and this after all the efforts of Calixtus and Pius! Those of the fallen princes who could make their escape flocked to Rome to implore the assistance of the Pontiff. Thomas Palæologus, despot of the Morea; Charlotte of Lusignan, Queen of Cyprus; Catherine, the mother of Corvinus, all found there a home and a generous protector.

But the troubles of the Pope were as great as the troubles of the exiles whom he befriended. His espousal of the cause of Ferrante stirred up dissension in Rome. Lawless bands of youths paraded the city and established a veritable reign of terror. The turbulent Roman barons took sides with René of Anjou, and entered into alliance with Piccinino and Malatesta, the Pope's most inveterate foes. His return to Rome (October 6, 1460) restored order within the city for the time.* But Malatesta, the powerful despot of Rimini, poet, philosopher, and patron of the arts, profligate, and warrior, continued till 1462 to disturb the northern provinces of the Papal dominions. More serious still was the hostility of France and Germany, the two great western powers of the continent. The Pragmatic sanction of Bourges, enacted as far back as 1438, had deprived the Holy See of all nominations to French benefices, and had forbidden the payment of any Papal taxes on their revenues; moreover, it had affirmed the superiority of Councils over the Pope. Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Calixtus III. had striven in vain to procure the repeal of this law. Undaunted by these repeated failures, Pius II. did not despair of success.† His espousal of Ferrante's cause

* His address to the envoys who met him at Viterbo, whether actually delivered or not, is worth quoting:—"What city is freer than Rome? You pay no taxes, you bear no burdens, you occupy the most honourable posts. You sell your wine and corn at the price you choose, and your houses bring you in rich rents. And, moreover, who is your ruler? Is he a count, a marquess, a duke, a king, or an emperor? No! one greater than all these—the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ. He it is who brings you glory and prosperity, and attracts the wealth of the whole world to your gates."—Pii II., "Comment.," 113, 114.

† "The French prelates," he writes in his "Memoirs," p. 160, "supposed that they would have greater liberty; but, on the contrary, they have been brought into grievous bondage, and made the slaves of the laity. They are forced to give an account of their affairs to Parliament; to confer benefices according to the good pleasure of the king and the more powerful nobles; to promote minors, unlearned, deformed, and illegitimate persons to the priestly

against René, however, little disposed the French King, Charles VII., to come to any favourable terms. Louis XI., who succeeded in 1461, began his reign by reversing all his father's policy, and hence was not indisposed to treat. As might be expected from the character of that Macchiavelian prince and his unprincipled envoy, Jouffroy, the negotiations were based on the principle of *do ut des*. If the Pope would support René and assist in the subjugation of the Genoese, Louis would not only withdraw the Pragmatic sanction, but would also send an army of 70,000 against the Turks. We cannot here follow the tangled mazes of the diplomacy of both sides in this discussion.* Pius at one stage of the proceedings seemed disposed to yield. The objectionable statute was repealed, at first conditionally and afterwards unconditionally (1462). Jouffroy received the cardinal's hat, though his nomination was opposed by many members of the Sacred College on account of his evil life. But as soon as Louis found that the Pope was not to be won over, even by the promise of aid for his darling crusade, all the obnoxious provisions of the Pragmatic sanction were renewed, and the hostility of the French Court became more marked than ever. Meantime, Bessarion's mission to Germany had proved an utter failure. His principal antagonist had been Diether, who had caused himself to be chosen Archbishop of Mayence, and had refused to pay the fees exacted by the Papal chancery. When excommunicated for his contumacy he had appealed to a General Council, and had stirred up the Count Palatine Frederick, the Elector Frederick of Brandenburg, his brothers Albert and John, together with the Bishop of Würzburg, to join in his appeal. At the Diet of Mayence

office ; to remit the punishment of those whom they have justly condemned ; to absolve the excommunicated without satisfaction. Any one conveying into France a Bull contrary to the Pragmatic sanction is made liable to the penalty of death. Parliament has meddled with the affairs of the bishops, with metropolitan churches, with marriage and matters of faith. The audacity of the laity has gone so far that even the most Holy Sacrament has been stopped by order of the king when borne in procession for the veneration of the people or for the consolation of the sick. Bishops and other prelates and venerable priests have been cast into common prisons. Church property and the goods of the clergy have been confiscated on trifling prettexts by a secular judge, and handed over to lay people." Is this a description of the Church in France in the middle of the fifteenth century, or at the end of the nineteenth ?

* Pastor, vol. iii. p. 136 *seq.*

he declared a Council to be the only remedy against the encroachments of Rome; he characterised the tithes and indulgences as frauds, and the Turkish war as merely a pretext to support them. This violent language on his part, and the conciliatory action of the Papal Nuncio, induced many of his supporters to fall away from him. A Bull was issued against him by Pius (January 8th, 1462), requiring him to give up all lands belonging to his bishopric; and, later on, Adolph of Nassau was nominated bishop in his stead. The whole story of Diether's conflict with the Holy See,* and the support which he received, is one more proof, if proof were needed, of the sure and certain preparation for the disastrous events of the next century. Much more was this the case in the dissensions between Bohemia and the Holy See—dissensions which were heretical rather than schismatical, and were all the more dangerous because the people as well as their princes were alienated from the teaching of the Church. Pius had himself been nuncio in Bohemia (1451), and so was in a position to understand thoroughly the celebrated compact entered into between the Bohemians and the Council of Basle (1433), whereby the use of the chalice had been granted to the laity. He knew well that the conditions insisted on by the Council† had been utterly disregarded, and that the compact had been used as a confirmation of heresy. Thus the Bohemians themselves had been the first to break the compact. Under these circumstances they could not complain when, after their envoys had been heard in Rome, the compact was annulled by the Holy See.‡

One of the first acts of Pius II.'s pontificate had been the appointment of a Commission to take measures for the reform of the Roman Court. "Two things are particularly near to my heart," he said to the members of this Commission, "the war with the Turks and the reform of the Roman Court." Two projects were brought forward: the one by Cardinal

* Pastor, vol. iii. p. 165 *seq.*

† When the Blessed Sacrament was administered under both kinds, the laity were to be reminded that Christ was present, wholly and entirely, under each species. The Bohemians were also to conform to the Church in other matters of dogma and discipline.

‡ Dr. Pastor devotes a whole chapter to the negotiations between George Podiebrad, King of Bohemia, and Pius II. (vol. iii. p. 213 *seq.*).

Nicholas of Cusa, the other by Domenico de' Domenichi. Cusa's plan embraced the reform of the whole Church. It recommended the abolition of pluralities; the inquiry into the condition of hospitals and the fabric of churches; the strict enclosure of nuns; the suppression of fraudulent dealers in indulgences; the examination of the genuineness of relics and miracles. As for the Court of Rome, the Cardinal insisted that the Pope himself should be rebuked whenever he gave any cause of scandal; the Court was not to be an asylum for idle and roaming prelates, beneficiaries, and religious, or to furnish them with opportunities for suing for higher dignities and richer benefices; all its members must conform to the rules of the Church, in conduct, morals, dress, tonsure, and observance of the canonical hours. Domenichi was of opinion that the reformation should begin with the Pope and the Cardinals, then be extended to the Bishops, and ultimately to the other members of the Church.* Had either of these schemes been carried out, there can be no doubt that the scandalous dissensions which darkened the history of the Church during the next hundred years would have been avoided. Who was to blame that so little was done? In justice to Pius II., it should be remembered that his anxiety to band all Christendom together against the Turk—a most praiseworthy object surely—prevented him from giving attention to matters which, though of great importance, were not of such pressing urgency. Then again, the troubles in Italy, in France, and in Germany were not favourable for a project which at first would have caused still further opposition to the Holy See. Those who clamoured most loudly for reform were the very persons whose own conduct stood most in need of it, and who would have been the first to resist any attempt to enforce it. The Pope's life was admitted to be beyond reproach. His promotion of his nephews and his beloved Sienese is not altogether defensible; but he had some excuse, seeing that he had determined foes and few friends in the Apostolic College. The licentious Rodrigo Borgia and other worldly cardinals and courtiers were often sharply rebuked by him. He took some steps to put a stop to the extortionate demands of the Roman

* His recommendations will be found in Pastor, vol. iii. p. 273 *seq.*

penitentiaries; he favoured the stricter Benedictine congregations, and also the Franciscan Observantines; he forbade the baptism of Jews under twelve years of age, against the will of their relations, and also the practice of compelling the Jews to work on Saturdays. By the canonisation of St. Catherine of Siena he was enabled to pay a deep debt of gratitude which the Holy See had incurred towards that glory of her sex, and at the same time to gratify his patriotic feelings: "To a Sienese," as he said, "has been granted the happy privilege of proclaiming the sanctity of a daughter of Siena." And, as all travellers know, that ancient city and the neighbouring Pienza are still full of memories of Pius II. and the Piccolomini. The mighty projects of Nicholas V. for the adornment of Rome had no attraction for him, nevertheless the roof of St. Peter's, the Lateran, Sta. Maria Maggiore, S. Stefano, Sta. Maria Rotunde (Pantheon), the Capitol, many of the bridges, and also the city walls were repaired by him. His well-known epigram expresses his veneration for the Eternal City and his indignation against those who would degrade it into a quarry:

Oblectat me, Roma, tuas spectare ruinas:
 Ex cujus lapsu gloria prisca patet,
 Sed tuus hic populus muris defossa vetustis
 Calcis in obsequium marmora dura coquit.
 Impia tercentum si sic gens egerit annos
 Nullum hinc indicium nobilitatis erit.*

The triumphant advance of the Turks roused the Pontiff to make a final effort to stir up a fresh crusade. The Neapolitan question was at rest for the time; Malatesta had been overthrown; and at last the Venetians had been roused by the insults and injuries which they suffered at the hands of the infidels. A fresh Congress was held at Rome (September 1463), which promised to be more successful than the abortive assembly of Mantua. The Pope's address and his subsequent Bull of Crusade cannot be read, even at this distance of time, without causing in us a glow of enthusiasm for the Holy War. He announced his intention, though against the advice of his physicians, of himself setting out with the expedition.

* The original is not given by Dr. Pastor. The English translators can hardly be complimented on their version of it.

Our cry, Go forth ! has resounded in vain. Perhaps, if the word is, Come with me ! it will have more effect It may be that seeing their Teacher and Father, the Bishop of Rome, the Vicar of Christ, a weak and sickly old man, going to the war, the Christian Princes will be ashamed to stay at home We are well aware that at our age we are going to an almost certain death. But let us leave all to God, His holy will be done ! We are too weak, indeed, to fight sword in hand, and this is not the priest's office. We will do as Moses did, who prayed upon a height while the people of Israel were doing battle with the Amalekites below.

This noble resolve did not produce the expected result. The envoys put all sorts of obstacles in the way of any concerted action. Some success was gained by the Hungarians under Matthias Corvinus, but the Venetians met with nothing but reverses in the Peloponnesus ; and the Duke of Burgundy, who had been one of the few princes to enter warmly into the Pope's plans, now failed to appear. Great opposition was raised, even in the Papal States, to the levying of contributions for the Crusade. The Cardinals, too, were openly opposed to the war. But all these difficulties, and all the bodily ailments from which he suffered, could not deter Pius from carrying out his heroic resolve. As he left the city (June 18th, 1464) he exclaimed with emotion : " Farewell, Rome ! never will you see me again alive." At Ancona, the port of assembly, he found that hardly anything was ready ; the Crusaders who had already arrived being without leaders, arms, or money. Then the excessive heat brought on a pestilence. At last, on August 12th, the approach of the Venetian fleet was announced. But it was now too late, for the broken-hearted Pontiff was sinking fast. He had himself carried to the window of his bed-chamber, and, as he gazed on the ships coming in, " Alas ! " he said, " hitherto the fleet has been wanting to me ; and now I must be wanting to the fleet." Next morning he received the Holy Viaticum, and the day following he delivered a farewell address to the Cardinals. He then begged his friend, Ammanati, to bring him once more the Blessed Sacrament on the Feast of Our Lady's Assumption ; but that same night, the eve of the feast, he peacefully passed away (August 14th, 1464).

With all his faults, and they were great and many, there is an undoubted charm about the story of Æneas Sylvius

Piccolomini. His autobiography and his letters, written in choice Latin, have laid bare for us with singular frankness the very recesses of his soul. It is from himself that we learn of his pagan scepticism, his shameless profligacy, his unbounded ambition, as well as of his repentance and his altered life. One vice, at any rate, cannot be laid to his charge—he was no hypocrite; and this, perhaps, more than anything else, makes us less severe in our judgment of him. And what a lesson is his career as Pope! Taken away from his beloved literary labours, a burden cast upon him which he was unfitted to bear, spending and being spent in the vain attempt to unite Christendom against the Turk, dying prematurely with the thought that he had failed in the one object for which he had sacrificed all else.—*Vanitas vanitatum et omnia vanitas.*

The next pontificate need not detain us long. Cardinal Barbo, a Venetian, a nephew of Eugenius IV., who had been nearly elected at the last Conclave, was now chosen Pope, and took the title of Paul II. (August 30th, 1464). The new Pontiff was a tall, well-made, handsome man; his bearing was dignified yet affable; in character he was generous and amiable. His love of splendour has been praised and blamed by different writers. His own defence of it was that the Pope ought to appear in a style befitting the highest dignity on earth, though his private life was exceedingly simple. He soon gave proof of his determination by setting aside the Election Capitulation, which would have reduced him, he said, to the position of a mere Doge. By his dismissal of certain Humanists from the Roman Chancery he incurred the fiercest hostility of the partisans of the Renaissance. Platina, who distinguished himself by his insolent conduct, and who was in return treated with much severity, afterwards revenged himself by writing a bitter and prejudiced life of Paul. A society of heathen-minded Humanists, under the presidency of the celebrated Pomponius Laetus, went so far as to enter into a conspiracy against the life of the Pope. As we are largely indebted to these scholars for our knowledge of the history of his pontificate, we are not surprised to find that he is usually depicted in a very unfavourable light. Still, the fact that they have been unable to accuse him of any serious faults has eventually told in his favour. Modern historians have

been enabled, by investigation of various archives, to give us a true portrait of the Pontiff. He was no opponent of the Renaissance in itself, nor, on the other hand, was he a Humanist of the style of Nicholas V.; he was simply a practical man of business who had little sympathy for mere scholarship. His collection of gems and antiquities, however, was one of the finest in the world; and his love of the architecture of the Renaissance has a lasting monument in the magnificent Palazzo di Venezia. As regards the work of reform, he began, like so many other Pontiffs, with the best intentions, but soon became discouraged by the difficulty of the task. His appointments to the Sacred College were, on the whole, excellent, though they included three of his nephews.* The troubles with the various Italian States, with France, and with Germany, which had disturbed the preceding pontificate, continued throughout Paul's reign. The pilgrimage of the Emperor Frederick III. to Rome, and his marked deference to the Pope, did much, however, to raise once more the fallen prestige of the Holy See.† Skanderbeg, the heroic king of Albania, also visited Rome (1466), and was generously entertained by Paul, who also gave him large sums of money to help him in his wars against the Turks. Though he continued as long as he lived to inflict defeats on the infidels, their progress in other quarters was unchecked. Mahomet II. had turned his attention to obtaining the command of the sea. The magnificent island of Eubœa (Negropont) fell into his hands in 1470, and now the whole coasts of the Adriatic seemed at his mercy. Once more a Congress assembled in Rome. The immediate nature of the danger induced the rival Italian States to conclude a general defensive alliance. At the same time efforts were made by the Pope to stir up the Sultan's enemies in the far east, but in the midst of the negotiations Paul II. was stricken down by apoplexy (July 26th, 1471).

Sixtus IV., who succeeded, was a man who might have been expected to render great service to the Church in the

* Thomas Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, received the hat in 1467. To please Louis XI., Jean de la Balue, bishop of Evreux, was nominated at the same time. "I know the faults of this priest," the Pope is reported to have said, "but I was constrained to cover them with this hat."

† Pastor, vol. iv. p. 160 *seq.*

hour of her need. A member of the Order of St. Francis, distinguished as a professor of philosophy and theology, and an eloquent preacher, he had been elected General of his Order in 1464 and had received the cardinal's hat in 1467.

A portrait from the hand of his Court painter, Melozzo da Forlì, which is still preserved, represents the new Pope as a man of middle stature, and strong, compact frame. The features are regular, the nose and forehead forming an oblique line, with a gentle curve between them. The powerful head impresses us with an idea of uncommon energy and force, which difficulties could not daunt ; while the lines on the brow bear witness to a life of hard, unremitting toil.*

What he would have done had he followed his own bent can only be a matter of conjecture ; for he at once carried nepotism to an excess hitherto unknown in the annals of the Church. As we study the story of the period treated of by Dr. Pastor, we cannot fail to be struck with the prevalence of this bane. Thus, Eugenius IV. was nephew of Gregory XII., and his nephew became Paul II. ; Alexander VI. was nephew of Calixtus III., Pius III. nephew of Pius II., and Julius II. nephew of Sixtus IV. No attempt will here be made to defend the practice, though it gave to the Church a S. Carlo Borromeo as well as a Rodrigo Borgia. We must, however, bear in mind that there were certain circumstances of the times which might be pleaded in extenuation. A Pope often owed his election less to the favour of the majority than to a compromise among several rivals. He found himself opposed at every turn by the existing members of the Sacred College, while secular princes demanded the hat for men who were avowedly hostile to his policy. What wonder if he took steps to secure a new majority on whom he could rely ? And where could he better find these than among his own relatives ? Even the ardent reformer, Domenico de' Domenichi, had admitted the lawfulness of the practice. But he had insisted that good men of mature age should be chosen, and unhappily this condition was often neglected. When Sixtus IV. became Pope he had fifteen nephews and grandnephews. Six of these, while quite young and undistinguished (one only seventeen years of age), were named cardinals and were loaded with the richest

* Pastor, iv. 209.

benefices; four others were married into princely families and received the highest secular posts. The most famous of the young clerics were Giuliano della Rovere and Pietro Riario, both of the Order of St. Francis. The former, who afterwards became Julius II., was made Archbishop of Avignon and of Bologna, Bishop of Lausanne, Coutances, Viviers, Monde, and finally of Ostia and Velletri, and Abbot of Nonantola and Grottaferrata. His moral character was not without blemish, but, as the times went, he was a fairly respectable prelate, if rather worldly. Far different was his cousin Pietro. A wit, a lover of good cheer, and splendour, and worse, a man of boundless ambition, he was utterly unfit for any ecclesiastical office. Yet he was made Archbishop of Florence (lately held by St. Antoninus), Patriarch of Constantinople, Abbot of S. Ambrogio, and bishop of numerous dioceses. In spite of his open profligacy he enjoyed the favour of the Pope more than any of the other nephews, so that it was even reported that Sixtus thought of resigning in his favour! But his scandals and ambitious projects were cut short by a penitent death (January 5, 1474), when he was only in his eight-and-twentieth year. His brother Girolamo, who was married to the natural daughter of Sforza, Duke of Milan, succeeded in the Pope's good graces and soon involved him in questionable designs.

The security of the Papal States depended mainly on the preservation of the balance of power among the Italian princes. It was during this pontificate that the policy was inaugurated which, under succeeding Popes, and notably under Julius II., led to the consolidation of the Temporal Power of the Holy See. We cannot here follow all the tangled maze of Italian diplomacy.* But there is one incident which cannot be passed over in any account of Sixtus' reign. After the assassination of Sforza (1476), Lorenzo de' Medici began to take the lead among the States of the north of Rome. He had been on such good terms with the Pope that the finances of the Holy See had been entrusted to his care and he had farmed the customs of Rome and the rich

* Dr. Pastor devotes no less than five chapters (v., vi., vii., ix., and x.) to this subject; yet a Protestant critic (*Guardian*, July 10) complains that he has not laid sufficient stress on it.

alum works at Tolfa. The cause of the rupture between him and Sixtus is somewhat involved in obscurity, but there is ample evidence of hostility on Lorenzo's part,* and it must be confessed that the Pope was far from conciliatory, especially in forcing Salviati into the see of Pisa against the will of the Florentines. The baneful influence of Girolamo, egged on by his wife, had much to do with the growth of ill-feeling between them. In 1478 the relations became so strained that the overthrow of the Medici appeared to be the only means of securing the Temporal Power. So strong, however, was Lorenzo's position that his enemies did not dare to attack him openly. On the other hand, the Pope would not lend himself to any plot to inflict upon him the same fate as had befallen Sforza. This difficulty was not insurmountable to villains like Girolamo and Salviati. They induced him to consent to an armed insurrection against the Medici, while privately they planned the assassination of Lorenzo and his brother Giuliano. The visit of young Cardinal Rafaelo to Florence offered an occasion for the accomplishment of their design. Lorenzo invited a brilliant company to a banquet in honour of his guest. Giuliano, who was to have been present, excused himself on the plea of ill-health, but promised to attend the High Mass in the Duomo. This change in the arrangements caused some disunion among the conspirators. The deed, if done at all, must now be executed in church on Sunday at the solemn hour of Mass. From such an infamy even a desperado like Montesecco, who had agreed to kill Lorenzo, shrank. His place, however, was taken by two clerics. The Cardinal, accompanied by Lorenzo and Giuliano Medici and a splendid array of clergy and nobles, entered the Duomo and the service began. Suddenly, one of the conspirators rushed at Giuliano and plunged his dagger into his side. The wounded man defended himself vigorously until Francesco de' Pazzi stabbed him to death. Meanwhile, Lorenzo had also been attacked, but being only slightly wounded had escaped into the sacristy. Outside the Cathedral Salviati's attempt to seize the Seignorial Palace and Jacopo de' Pazzi's appeal to insurrection utterly failed. The

* Pastor, vol. iv. p. 292 seq.

enraged populace fell upon the conspirators and slaughtered them all without mercy. Some days later Montesecco, too, was seized and beheaded.* The failure of this abominable plot enormously strengthened the hands of Lorenzo, who henceforth rose to absolute power in Florence. On the other hand, the Pope, who had allowed his honoured name and office to be associated with it, suffered a corresponding loss of prestige. Yet he did not abate in any way his opposition to the Medici. While regretting the sacrilegious and murderous acts of the conspirators, he insisted on satisfaction from the Florentines for their repeated violation of ecclesiastical immunities and detention of Cardinal Rafaello, and finally excommunicated Lorenzo and his adherents, and laid Florence under an Interdict. The struggle continued for more than two years longer, when at length peace was suddenly concluded, for the terrible news was brought that the Turks had landed in Italy and captured Otranto.

We have seen how the great sultan Mahomet II. had obtained the command of the sea and threatened the western shores of the Adriatic. The alliance entered into between the Holy See and Venice and Naples warded off his attacks for a time. A great Christian fleet even sailed to Asia Minor and seized the wealthy city of Smyrna (1472); but dissension among the leaders threw away the advantage of this success. In 1475 Mahomet gained possession of the rich Genoese colony of Caffa in the Crimea, and, profiting by the feuds between the Pope and the Medici, largely increased his dominions in Europe. The island of Rhodes, the last bulwark of Eastern Christendom, was vigorously attacked in 1480, but the heroic defence of the Knights of St. John withstood all the Sultan's efforts. This check was counterbalanced by the success of his fleet in the West. Italy, the seat of the Papacy, the arch enemy of Islam, had always been the desired goal of each conquering sultan. With Venice and Naples at variance, with the Pope in conflict with the powerful Medici, the conquest of the peninsula did not seem a formidable task. A landing was effected in Apulia; Otranto was taken and its inhabitants

* Before his execution he confessed his own guilt, but expressly exonerated Sixtus from all complicity in the plot to assassinate the brothers (see Pastor, vol. iv. p. 303 *seq.*).

were subjected to unexampled barbarities. All Italy was stricken with consternation as the awful tidings got abroad. The Pope, who had made preparations for his flight to Avignon, sent round imploring appeals to the Italian princes to put an end to their disputes and to unite to drive out the infidel. Once again a conference was held in Rome. No help was forthcoming from distracted Germany; Edward IV. of England declared that he could do nothing; the King of France demanded to be secured from an English attack before he would contribute to the war against the Turks. The Italians, however, who were more directly menaced, entered into the crusade with great vigour, Sixtus setting a striking example by sending his plate and sacred vessels to be coined down to meet the expenses of the expedition. While all Italy was engaged in anxious preparations, it was rumoured that the dread enemy of Christendom was no more. The news of Mahomet's death seemed too good to be true, but as soon as it was confirmed beyond any doubt, the inhabitants of the threatened provinces gave way to unrestrained joy, the Pope himself taking part in the processions of thanksgiving. Though some of the allies thought that all danger was now at an end, the majority felt that the time had come for striking a favourable blow. A great fleet set sail for Otranto. The Turks held out with their usual obstinate valour, but at length (September 10th) the city was once more in the hands of the Christians. With the passing of the danger all unity ceased between the allies. Sixtus endeavoured in vain to keep his own fleet together. Unseemly disputes about the division of the booty and about arrears of pay demoralised his men, and the outbreak of the plague completed their disruption.

In the midst of his conflict with Florence, Sixtus joined with Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain in establishing the Spanish Inquisition (November 1st, 1478). He soon found occasion, however, to remonstrate with those sovereigns for their severity and their attempt to turn a spiritual court into a political institution.

As it is mercy alone [he wrote] that makes us like to God, we beg and exhort the King and the Queen, for the love of Jesus Christ, to imitate Him, whose property it is always to have mercy and to spare. Let them

have compassion on their subjects in the city and diocese of Seville, who are sensible of their errors and ask pardon.

Still, it must be borne in mind that he himself had established the Inquisition, and that he condemned only the abuse of it. Attempts to clear him of his responsibility and to consider it as a merely State institution, cannot be justified by the facts of the case.*

In the matter of reform, the most crying need of the Church, Sixtus did next to nothing. A Bull was drawn up at his command containing provisions for the amendment of his Court. Unhappily, it was never published, for the majority of the Cardinals were strongly opposed to measures which would necessarily be directed against their own unworthy conduct. The political complications in which the Pope became entangled through his infatuation for his nephews led even to fresh abuses. He added to the crowds of venal officials; he strained to the utmost his rights of taxation; he diverted the revenues of the Roman University; yet his Treasury was

* Dr. Pastor has an admirable note on this subject (vol. iv. p. 404), which shall be quoted in full as an example of his honesty and learning. "The view which regarded the Spanish Inquisition as a purely State institution was popularised in France by De Maistre ('Lettre à un gentilhomme Russe sur l'Inquisition Espagnole,' 11-12, Lyon, 1837), and in Germany by Ranke (Fürsten und Völker, i. 241 *seq.*, Hamburg, 1827; and with slight alterations also in the fourth edition of 1877, p. 195 *seq.*). It has been recently put forward on the Catholic side by three other historians: Gams ('Zur Geschichte der Span. Staatsinquisition,' Regensburg, 1878); Hergenröther ('Kirchengesch.,' ii. 765, 3rd ed., and 'Staat und Kirche,' p. 607 *seq.*); and Knöpfler (Rohrbacher's 'Kirchengesch.,' 68 f., and 'Hist. polit. Bl.,' xc. 325 *seq.*, and xci. 135 *seq.*). In favour of the opinion we have adopted above, may be cited the old theologians of the Inquisition, such as Paramo and Carena, who must have been accurately acquainted with the matter; and, among modern writers, Balmez ('Protest. und Kath.,' ii. 177, Regensburg, 1845); Prat ('Histoire du P. Ribadeneira,' 347 *seq.*, Paris, 1862); Orti y Lara ('La Inquisicion,' Madrid, 1877); Rodrigo, Grisar (see 'Innsbr. Zeitschr. für Kath. Theologie,' 1879, p. 548 *seq.*); Bauer (*loc. cit.*, 1881, p. 742 *seq.*); F. X. Kraus ('Alzog's Kirchengesch.,' ii. 106, N. 3, 10th ed.); Funk ('Lit. Rundschau,' 1880, p. 77 *seq.*, and 'Kirchengesch.,' 360); Brück ('Kirchengesch.,' p. 533, 4th ed., and 'Kirchenlexicon,' vi. 765 *seq.*, 2nd ed.); and Julio Melgares Marin ('Procedimientos de la Inquisicion,' 2 vols., Madrid, 1886, i. 82 *seq.*). This last, who is keeper of the Archives at Alcalá, speaks with full knowledge of their contents. On the Protestant side see 'Herzog,' vi. 740 *seq.*, 2nd ed. (Benrath), and 'Allg. Ztg.,' 1878, p. 1122. Excessive regard for the authority of Ranke has prevented the general acceptance of the correct view of this question, and, in the case of Catholic publicists, it is hard to decide how far apologetic considerations may have weighed in their adoption of the theory of a State institution. Apologetic ends must not, however, be allowed to influence the historian, whose sole aim should be truth." And yet Dr. Pastor is accused of being an unscrupulous apologist of the Papacy!

always in difficulties through the squandering of his finances. On the other hand, it should be remembered that he was a munificent patron of literature and the arts; and if he did not entertain all the vast schemes of Nicholas V., he nevertheless has been surpassed by few Popes in what he accomplished for the adornment of Rome. S. Maria del Popolo, S. Maria della Pace, S. Pietro in Vincoli, and SS. Apostoli; these churches with all their exquisite early Renaissance architecture and carving were the work of Sixtus and his relatives. The Ponte Sisto which he constructed still bears witness to his name. And the traveller who journeys over the weary waste of the Campagna to Ostia and Grotta Ferrata will forgive something to the family which raised those two picturesque castles, which add such a charm to the view. But there is one other of Sixtus' works which far surpasses all of these. Franciscan as he was,* he was filled, in spite of all his faults, with a tender love of Mary Immaculate. In 1475 he approved of a special office of the Immaculate Conception for December 8th. He also drew up the oft-quoted Constitution which, without pronouncing any definite decision on the doctrine, laid down stringent rules regarding public attacks on it. It was in honour of this privilege of Our Lady that he built and adorned the noble chapel at the Vatican which still bears his name. The architect was the Florentine, Giovannino de' Dolci, while the artists were no other than Ghirlandajo, Botticelli, Signorelli, Roselli, Perugino, and Pinturicchio.

As we survey this sanctuary of Italian Renaissance we cannot fail to acknowledge that the choice of subjects for the frescoes could not have been better. To the chief scenes from the life of Moses on the one side correspond on the other those from the life of Our Lord, as the fulfilment of their typical signification. What Moses, the leader of the Chosen People, foreshadowed, has been perfected by Christ for all time. Peter, who lives in his successors here, reigns as the Vicar of Christ. Through him the human race is brought to the Saviour, as the Jewish nation, the type of Christendom, was led by Moses to the feet of Christ. The development of the whole plan of Salvation is concentrated in the three names: Moses, Christ, Peter. Thus the magnificent drama of the story of the Church is presented to the spectator as the Life and the Truth in the frescoes of this chapel, which in its historical aspect is the most remarkable in the world; and thus worthily was the building

* He canonised St. Bonaventure, April 14, 1482.

fitly inaugurated, which afterwards, under another Pope of the house of Rovere, was to be enriched with the marvellous productions of the giant genius of Michael Angelo.*

Meanwhile the Pope's evil genius, Girolamo Riario, had involved the Holy See in an alliance with Venice against Naples. At first the southern kingdom obtained some success, but the great battle of Campo Morto in the Pontine Marshes was a complete victory for the allies. The death of Malatesta, who had commanded their army, led to the retirement of the Venetians, and soon afterwards we find Sixtus making peace with Naples. Later on, we find him at war with Venice and laying that city under Interdict. Here again it is impossible for us to examine into the causes of these marked changes of policy. Dr. Pastor has gone into them with marvellous patience and skill, and with a fairness which cannot be denied. He lets us see that Girolamo's unprincipled ambition and Sixtus' weak compliance were chiefly to blame for much of the miserable dissension in the Italian States. By the middle of the year 1484 Girolamo had to own to his uncle that there was little hope of subduing their rivals. The Pope became greatly agitated at these tidings, especially as he was suffering at the time from fever and gout. Then came the news of the peace of Bagnolo (Aug. 7th), which was a veritable triumph for Venice. This was more than he could bear. The hand of death was already upon him, and during the night of the feast of St. Clare he breathed his last (Aug. 12th, 1484).

In surveying the period covered by the preceding volumes of Dr. Pastor's history we noted the vast change for the better which had taken place in the position of the Holy See during the Pontificates of Martin V., Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Calixtus III. No such progress, alas! can be recorded in the reigns of the succeeding Pontiffs. True, we hear no more of disputed elections, or of a council sitting in defiance of the Popes. Yet we cannot but feel that their authority has been undermined, and that their hold on Christendom, especially on Germany, has been weakened. The scandals in the Sacred College have brought discredit on the highest ecclesiastical offices;

* Pastor, vol. iv. p. 470.

instead of reforms, abuses have increased with astounding rapidity. In the time of Pius II. there were some signs of improvement; under Paul II. it was still possible; but Sixtus IV. destroyed all hopes, and henceforth there was nothing left but a revolution.

T. B. SCANNELL.

ART. V.—THE FALL OF THE KNIGHTS OF THE TEMPLE.

1. *La Règle du Temple.* Edited by M. HENRI DE CURZON. Paris. 1886.
2. *Le Procès de l'Ordre et des Frères du Temple.* Par M. LAVOCAT. Paris. 1888. Records in the Rolls.

THE Church has always been prolific in religious Orders suited to contemporary needs; and the old days when Europe tended naturally towards the Holy Land, when religion was the central thought, and when even worldlings moved perforce under its influence, brought forth in the regular course of events the military Orders. In their case, too, as in that of some other religious brotherhoods, it might be expected that they would drop out of existence as the necessity which called them into being died away. But the history of the Order of the Temple is unique. Its rapid increase, its glory and prosperity, its sudden downfall, form a cameo sharply cut out from the annals of the Middle Ages.

About the year 1098 a French and a Flemish knight who had followed Godefroy de Boulogne to the Holy Land devoted themselves to prayer, penance, and the protection of pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem. The vocation of Hugues de Payens and Godefroy de Saint Omer supplied a need of the time. Companions joined them; they took monastic vows; and Baldwin II., King of Jerusalem, together with the Augustinian canons of the Holy Sepulchre, gave them a habitation near the site of the ancient Temple, whence they began to be called “*pauperes commilitones Christi Templique Solomonici.*”

Gifts and bequests flowed in on the new Order; the chivalry of Europe flocked into its ranks. In 1127 Pope Honorius II. resolved to place the Knights Templars on a more regular footing in the Church. To this end, in 1128, he called a Council at Troyes, at which Hugues de Payens was

present, and over which Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, was commanded to preside.

The vocation of the Templars, with its union of prayer, mortification, and Christian valour, was peculiarly agreeable to the spirit of St. Bernard. He was heart and soul a Crusader, but a Crusader inspired by common-sense no less than by religious ardour. He wanted disciplined armies to send to the Holy Land, and not a helpless rabble; above all, armies vowed to the practice of the evangelical counsels. He welcomed the Templars as invaluable auxiliaries, and threw himself with zest into the work of forming their Rule.

There has been much disputation concerning this Rule of the Templars. The enemies of the Order in after times did not fail to make capital of alterations which were introduced by degrees, and which so modified the text edited by St. Bernard that in some particulars the "French Rule," as the later edition was called, contradicted the Latin Rule sanctioned by the Council of Troyes. But Pope Honorius and St. Bernard themselves intended that modifications should be made according to exigencies of time and place. The Rule even in its latest developments is Cistercian and Bernardine.

M. de Curzon, the learned editor of "*La Règle du Temple*," is of opinion that the Latin Rule, the original of which had been appended to the *procès-verbal* of the Council of Troyes, was several times revised, and that the French Rule is subsequent even to the latest revision of the Latin Rule.* It was customary to entrust copies of the whole Rule only to the great dignitaries of the Order; even the commanders of monasteries often possessed only abridgments. But whatever alterations were made in the Rule in course of time were well known to and approved by the Holy See, to which the Order was directly subject; nor did the Rule, so far as it concerned the daily life of the barrack-cloister, diverge to any notable extent from the lines laid down at Troyes. To its last day, as M. de Curzon remarks, it consisted of regulations which were entirely monastic, austere, and irreproachable.

The obligation of assisting daily at mass and Office, and of saying paternosters where the knight or brother was unable to

* Introduction.

read;* two Lents in the year, besides numerous other fasts; weekly chapter and discipline for faults; abundant almsgiving; charitable treatment of sick and aged brethren, in whose favour all fasts were relaxed; kindly care of animals; plainness of armour and caparisons, in distinction to the dandyism of the secular knights of that day—these form the salient features of the Rule. The white tunic and mantle, emblems of chastity, belonged to the knights; the serving-brothers wore brown or black; so, too, did the married brothers who in early days were affiliated to the Order.† All bore on their mantles the great red cross.

The Grand Master, the seneschal and marshal, were the highest superiors of the Order; below them ranked the commanders of provinces. But the Order was a kind of aristocratic republic; and the Grand Master had not even a casting vote in the great chapter.

Later, in 1173, Pope Alexander III. gave formal permission to the Order to enrol priests as chaplains, and exempted them from all episcopal authority. The brothers were exhorted to confess to their chaplains exclusively, “*car ils ont greignor pooir, de l’apostoile, d’eaus assoudre, que un arceuesque.*”‡

At the time of the Council of Troyes, the Order was spreading rapidly throughout the West. Hugues de Payens himself founded the first English home of the Templars, to the south of Holborn, on a spot where some excavations which were made about a hundred and sixty years ago revealed the remains of the round chapel in Caen stone. Towards the end of the twelfth century the magnificent buildings of the New Temple, complete with ranges of cloisters, barracks, and terraces, arose beside the Thames; and the Patriarch of Jerusalem himself, in the year 1185, consecrated the Church in honour of “Our Ladye Seynte Marie.”

The Order was then in the first flush of its glory. The martial story of the Crusades fills up the annals of the twelfth century. At Gaza, Tyre, Acre, Ascalon, the Templars and

* Thirteen paternosters were added in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, patroness of the Order, “beginning and end of our religious profession.”

† These did not reside in the “camps” with the regular brothers who had taken the vows.

‡ French rule.—“For they have greater power from the Pope to absolve them than an Archbishop.”

the Hospitallers slew and were slain. Everywhere the Friars-preachers and Friars-minor quested for the soldier-monks; they were the *corps d'élite*, the chosen children of the Holy See. They would have been exterminated in war, but that the noble youth of Europe filled up their ranks. Their wealth was great, but they also gave great alms; and when the disastrous struggle with the power of the Soldans was diverted to Egypt, it was the Templars who paid the ransoms of St. Louis.

Owing to national jealousies all the bloodshed and treasure-shed bought but a barren glory. The Orders of the Temple and the Hospital, too, though the knights of each were bound to follow the other's gonfalon in battle if separated from their own, gave way to an *esprit de corps* which hindered their efficiency. When Acre fell in 1291 Europe was inclined to throw the blame on the military Orders. It was then that Pope Nicolas IV. called a Council at Salzburg, with a view to a fusion of the Hospital, the Temple, and the Teutonic Order.* The Templars, proud of their great past, opposed the project. This short-sighted policy rang the knell of that glorious brotherhood which for a century and a half had been the vanguard of the Christian armies.

In France at least the Order had numerous enemies: they were to be found among the new noblesse, whom Philip IV., to strengthen his own power, had selected out of the bourgeoisie, among the clever hungry jurists, and among the clergy, who envied its exemption from taxation. A cry began to be raised that the Temple had had its day, and had failed in its *raison d'être*. It was rich; throughout Europe it possessed nine thousand manors; its treasures were everywhere full; these riches would be better in other hands. The French world, from the king down to his newest *bourgeois gentilhomme*, suddenly became aware that the interests of religion required the ruin of the Order of the Temple.

There were in the institution itself certain peculiarities of which an enemy would not be slow to take hold. The reservation of the Rule in its entirety to high dignitaries of the Order suggested the existence of a secret body of doctrine and

* A similar fusion had been advocated by St. Louis of France, and by Pope Gregory X.

of laws. It was a fact that externs were seldom present at the reception of new subjects into the proud and exclusive Order, and hence arose suspicions as to the mode of initiation. The assertion, very generally made, that the chapters were generally held by night was not borne out by evidence on the various trials, but it was none the less commonly maintained.

From secrecy it seemed easy to argue Gnosticism. Europe had for two or three centuries been more or less invaded by a horrible mysticism imported from the East. Heresies as to the divine and human natures of Our Lord had been followed by the worship of Baphomet and the Ogdoode, the cultus of the black cat, and the various devilries of Manicheans, Cathiarists, and Albigenses. In those days it was a favourite vituperation, from which the highest authorities of the Church did not always escape, to charge an obnoxious person or community with some of these practices and beliefs. That charge was now brought against the Templars. It was a new and a strange weapon with which to attack the consecrated chivalry which had always been especially favoured by the Holy See. True, the novitiate exacted by the primary Rule had fallen into disuse, and so had the law which forbade the readmission, after penance and absolution, of excommunicated deserters; yet until this time (about the year 1306) there had been no outcry as to widespread corruption in the Order. Also, the outcry was confined to France.

King Philip IV., or Le Bel, was always in such extreme need of money that he had already thought fit to be scandalised by the impiety of the Lombards and Jews, the seizure of whose property was the natural outcome of his fervour. The Templars were a greater prey. But Philip was accustomed to contend with great antagonists. He was now just issuing from his deadly struggle with Pope Boniface VIII. A Pontiff of dauntless courage, Boniface had opposed Philip's invasion of ecclesiastical rights, and in consequence became the object of monstrous calumnies, some of them identical with the very accusations which Philip afterwards levelled at the Templars. The king, being excommunicated, appealed to a future General Council, and commanded all the ecclesiastics in his dominions to second the appeal. The Cistercians, and others who refused, were thrown into prison. But the French Templars,

for once rather national than Catholic, adhered to the appeal.

To students of Church history, it is not surprising to find that this act of complaisance to the civil power was speedily followed by the ruin of the knights at the hands of that very power. Vain was the hope of compromise with a king greedy of the possessions of his subjects.

There was this difference between Henry VIII. of England when he suppressed the monasteries, and Philip IV. in his persecution of the Templars. Henry acted in defiance of the Popes; Philip coerced a Pope into becoming in part his instrument.

The irony of time has brought forward a historian of Philip's own nation to paint in fiery colours his turpitude and savagery. M. Lavocat's work, though not altogether discriminating, is more valuable than the pages of Sismondi, in that he writes from a Catholic point of view. No doubt his standpoint is too exclusively French. The author almost seems to forget the fact that the Templars were an international and sovereign Order, not more French than they were Spanish, English, or German; he touches but slightly, for instance, on their great power and influence in Aragon and Castile, and even carries his Gallicism so far as to reproach them with refusing to unite with the Hospitallers because the fused Orders "could have created a vast maritime empire in the Levant and in Greece . . . and opened to France an immense commercial and political future" (p. 49). By so French a writer the guilt of France in the persecution of the Templars is all the more strikingly brought out.

The high-spirited Boniface VIII. was dead. His successor, Benedict XI., relieved Philip from the excommunication; but his reign was short, and Philip made every effort to secure a successor who should be altogether at his disposal. He knew that Bertrand le Gotte, Archbishop of Bordeaux, aimed at the Papal throne; he promised him his support on certain conditions. One of these was the revocation of all Bulls and acts of Boniface, another was probably the destruction of the Order of the Temple, "the right arm of the Papacy."

Bertrand won his election; but his heart was transformed with his dignity when he became Clement V. He saw the

impossibility of condemning his predecessor's memory, declaring him guilty of heresy, and burning his bones, according to Philip's outrageous demands. He would willingly, too, have saved the Knights Templars. There was at his ear a traitor who, though for years he had been a *cameriere* and a personage of confidence at the Papal Court, had never yet thought fit to make known the abuses which he now declared to exist in the Order. This was Cardinal Cantilupo, one of the only two Templars living in whose favour the Rule had been relaxed, which forbade the admission of children into the Temple; he had been received at the age of ten, on account of his high rank. From him emanated the denunciations of which Clement, in his subsequent Bulls, spoke as having been addressed personally himself; and which were supported by "the king, dukes, counts, barons, and commonalty of France." But Clement cannot have credited these charges, because he was always of opinion that a General Council would find the Templars innocent; and even now he advocated a fusion between the Temple and the Hospital, a thing assuredly not to be thought of if one of these Orders was stained with heresy and crime. To this end he summoned the two Grand Masters before him at Poitiers. Foulgues de Vilaret was detained before Rhodes; but Jacques de Molay, who had succeeded Bellogisco, slain at Acre, as Grand Master of the Temple, journeyed from Cyprus at Clement's bidding, all unknowing of the "direful doom" which awaited him in France. The Pope and king received him honourably; but de Molay, brave, blunt, undiplomatic, unlettered, devoted to what he conceived to be the interests of his Order, was strongly opposed to the project of fusion. His conduct made no difference to his fate or the fate of the Temple. A fusion was the last thing desired by Philip, who had already (September 14, 1307) sent out *lettres de cachet* to the governors and crown officers throughout France, commanding the arrest of the Templars, and the detention of their goods until further orders from himself.*

* M. Lavocat is right in saying that there were two distinct prosecutions, the one of the Order, the other of the persons of the brothers; a fact which has not been clear to some historians. The Pope alone could deal with the Order; the brothers could be prosecuted by the Sovereigns in whose dominions they resided at the time.

The Grand Master was ignorant of this step when he followed Philip to Paris, where, on the 26th of October, both assisted in state at the funeral of Catherine Courtenay, wife of Philip's brother. On the following day the great blow fell. De Molay and 140 brothers were suddenly arrested and dragged to prison; the king took possession of the Temple, and by uniting his own treasure with the treasure of the Order made the two inextricably one.

On the horrors that followed it is only necessary to dwell so far as to show by what kind of legal process the guilt of the Templars was proved. Without authorisation from Clement V., torture was freely employed by the inquisitors and the officers of the Crown. The evidence said to have been extracted by this means is hardly worthy of notice; first, because torture can never serve the cause of truth; and secondly, because even the depositions taken in the torture-chambers are of doubtful authenticity. It is well known that the French jurists were always able to prove what the king desired. Most of the knights were unlettered, and unable to follow the Latin *procès-verbal*; nearly all who were said to have confessed either retracted their confessions, or denied that they had ever made them. In order, therefore, to weigh the indictment of the Templars, I purpose to dwell chiefly on the inquiry held in England, which, though by no means without its harsh and arbitrary features, was yet fair and mild compared to the trial in France.

From the first Philip IV. was fiercely anxious to see his lead followed by other sovereigns, and especially by Edward II. of England, his vassal for Guienne and future son-in-law. Clement V. had not as yet sent out the Bulls in which he commanded an international trial of the Order of the Temple, when Philip sent to London as his special agent the inquisitor Peleti, who had already distinguished himself in France by his merciless treatment of the Templars. But Philip's plans met with a temporary check. The sympathies of Edward, his prelates, barons, and people, were with the Knights Templars. Herr Schottmüller supposes that Edward was at this time (November 1307) still under the influence of the wise counselors of his predecessor. He wrote to Philip, saying that he found it impossible to believe the knights guilty of the heresies and

crimes described by Master Peleti; nay, more, he sent letters to the Kings of Portugal, Castile, Aragon, and Sicily, expressing his opinion that it was most unseemly to condemn the Order of the Temple, "which had always been renowned for piety and virtue, had fought for God and the Church, and was known to be a stronghold of the Catholic Faith." He interceded for the Order with the Pope himself, whom he besought to protect the brothers "against illegal proceedings, dictated by envy and malice."

Yet, in the following year, Edward entirely withdrew his protection from the Templars. The learned author of the "*Proces der Tempelherren*" attributes this change to the levity of Edward's character, to an awakening appetite for possible spoils, and to favours accorded to him at this time by Clement V. He could hardly have refused to institute an inquiry at the instance of the Pope, whose Bull "*Pastoralis preminentie*" reached England early in 1308-9; and Archbishop Robert Winchelsey, whom Schottmüller describes as purposely detained at the Papal Court, made no difficulty about sending instructions to his suffragans to preside at the proceedings in the Southern Province. But the blow fell suddenly on the Templars in England. On September 14 orders were sent to the sheriffs to arrest them in all parts, and deliver them over to the custody of the constables of the Tower of London, and of the castles of York and Lincoln. As the Tower would not hold all the prisoners, the "four gates of the City" were requisitioned of the Mayor and Corporation, as also "the houses lately occupied by the Penitent Friars."*

The Pope sent over as his commissioners at the London trial, the Abbot of Luguy, and de Vaux, a canon of Narbonne, who, together with Ralph, Bishop of London, opened the inquiry in the chapter house of Whitefriars, in November 1309. The principal heads of the indictment, as contained in the Papal Bull, were as follows: That the brethren at their reception were asked to deny Christ and to spit on the Cross. That some of them held Christ to have been a false Prophet. That they did not believe in the Holy Eucharist nor in the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints.

* Close Rolls, Edward II.

That in some provinces they adored an idol head, twofold or threefold, and wore round their waists cords which had touched this idol. That they adored a cat. That they swore to advance the Order *per fas aut nefas*. That they practised various immoralities. That they believed in the power of the Grand Master and commanders, although laymen, to absolve them from sin. That their priests omitted the words of consecration in the Mass.

The first article of examination was that touching reception, and the evidence of the brothers all went to show that this was carried out in accordance with the simple and devout form prescribed in the Rule. Henry de Tadcaster, received at Flaxflete, deposed that a number of the brothers were present at his reception, but no seculars, as custom did not allow of their admission on such occasions. He had sworn on the Gospels, *i.e.*, a page of the Gospels on which the Crucifixion was represented,* to observe poverty, chastity, and obedience, never to do an injustice, nor to kill any one except in war or in self-defence, after which he received the white mantle and the helmet. "There is no other way of receiving brothers into the said Order," the witness further deposed.†

In like manner Thomas Chamberleyne took his oath that there was only one mode of reception in all countries. He had first heard of the rumour of an impious rite of initiation about two years before. Asked whether he believed that any of the

* This form must have been substituted for the earlier one of swearing on the altar itself. The formula of profession was as follows:—"Vis abrenunciare sæculo?—Volo. Vis profiteri obedientiam secundum canonicum institutionem et secundum præceptum domini nostri Papæ?—Volo. Vis assumere tibi conversationem fratrum nostrorum?—Volo." (The psalm "Deus auxilietur et benedicat nobis.")

"Ego regulam commilitonum Christi et milicie ejus Deo adjuvante servare volo, et promitto propter vitæ eternæ premium, ita ut ab hac die non mihi liceat collum excutere de jugo regulæ; et ut hæc petitio professionis firmiter teneatur, hanc conscriptam obedientiam in presentia fratrum in perpetuum trado, et manu mea sub altare pono, quod est consecratum in honore Dei omnipotentis et B. Mariæ et omnium Sanctorum, et dehinc promitto obedientiam Deo et huic domui, et sine proprio vivere, et castitatem tenere secundum præceptum dñi papæ; et conversationem fratrum domus militiæ Christi firmiter tenere." (A vow to be always ready to succour the Holy Land was often added, and sometimes a vow never to dwell in a place of which a Christian had been unjustly disinherited, &c.) The white mantle and helmet were then bestowed on the new knight, and the commander gave him the "pax" on the lips.—"Règle," &c.

† Wilkins, "Concilia," vol. ii. p. 335.

brothers had spontaneously confessed to abuses in presence of the Pope and cardinals, he boldly answered "No."

Of the same tenor was the evidence of knight after knight, brother after brother. Sir William Raven made a slight diversion by deposing that about a hundred externs had been present at his reception at Templecombe in Somerset, at the hour of prime in the chapel. William de la More, Grand Commander of England, had received him. Raven himself could not read, but some of the lettered brothers read the Rule to him aloud. I am at a loss to know why the inquisitors enjoined the custodians of the knights, under pain of the greater excommunication, not to let Raven speak or consort with his brothers after this deposition.

Of great importance for the defence of the Order was the history of Robert le Scot, who "had entered the Order twenty-six years before, and afterwards left it through levity and remained in the world for two years." Then, coming to Rome, he confessed himself to the Pope's penitentiary, *by whose advice he returned to the Order of the Temple*, and after many prayers and much penance was readmitted at Nicosia, in Cyprus, by command of the Grand Master actually ruling (de Molay).

Clearly, then, the evil opinion conceived of the Order by the Holy See was of very recent date.

Futhermore: "W. Cumbroke, procurator of St. Clement Danes near the New Temple; Thomas, vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; Hamo, procurator of St. Bride's, and John Warwick, priest of St. Dunstan's," all neighbours, testified that they knew of nothing against the Templars.

Nevertheless, on the 4th of February, 1310, the Bishop of London and inquisitors, meeting at St. Martin's, Ludgate, brought out fourteen new articles, dealing with the alleged lay absolutions in chapter, denial of the Sacraments, and blind obedience to superiors, as well as with the charges of idolatry and immorality. Brother Ralph de Barton, chief chaplain of the Temple, was examined at great length, and denied all the charges. He took his oath that he always said the words of consecration in the Mass, and was convinced that the other priests did the same, and that all the brothers believed in the Holy Eucharist. He had never heard of the

adoration of a cat or of idols ; and the absurdity of this count was brought out by the inquiry whether it was true that the brothers swore *on the Sacrament* to conceal their idolatrous practices. Examined about the little cords worn by the Templars, Barton answered that they were given to the brothers after their reception as a token of chastity, and had nothing to do with idolatry. One point alone of this priest-Templar's evidence was unsatisfactory : it concerned the death of Sir Walter de Bachelier, late commander in Ireland, who had been accused of making away with the property of the Order, and who died in the penitential cell of the Temple Church, as it would appear, of the rigours of his imprisonment.

About this time an order was sent to Crumbwell, constable of the Tower, to keep the Templars in fetters, and not to allow them to talk together. Later, in August, a further order followed to deliver the Templars to the inquisitors when required, and to permit the inquisitors, according to ecclesiastical law, to do what they would with the bodies of the said Templars.* One is at a loss to account for extra securities at this time, especially as the testimonies against the Templars were nearly all at second-hand. The witnesses had usually learned their facts from some one else, who was dead, or could not be found, or at least was not produced. Thus, Robert le Dorturier had heard that the Templars had acquired property unjustly at Isleworth ; he had also heard of immoral practices, but only from "a man of Isleworth," who once stayed at his brother Adam's house. Adam le Dorturier himself being produced, could give no evidence against the Order. A friar minor related how

a veteran, who had left the Order of the Temple, told him that there were four principal idols in England : one in the sacristy in London, one at Bystelsham, one at Bruer, and one "beyond the Humber"; and that it was Brother de la More who had introduced this misery into England, and brought thither a large folio, in which were written out the nefarious idolatrous practices.

But the friar, being questioned as to the name of this veteran deserter, answered *that he understood that he had changed his name.*†

* Close Rolls, Edward II.

† Wilkins, "Concilia," vol. ii. p. 363.

Another testimony for the prosecution was that of a woman, named Agnes Lovehote, caretaker of a gentleman's house in the suburbs of London. This woman declared that she had contrived to conceal herself in one of the buildings of the Temple, and had witnessed a midnight assembly of the Templars, when they worshipped with infernal rites a black image with brilliant eyes. Hers is just the sort of hysterical declaration which some woman was sure to make at a time of public excitement.

So unsatisfactory was the evidence for the prosecution, that the alleged confessions of Sir Galfrid de Gonaville before the French Commissioners, in which he certified that he had been made to spit on the Cross at his reception, was sent over and laid before the English tribunal.*

Strangely enough, the only crime which was finally held to be proved by the English inquisitors was that of a wrong belief concerning the Sacrament of Penance. Sir William de la More was examined on this subject in June 1310, when he explained satisfactorily enough that the pardon given by lay superiors in chapter referred merely to faults against the Rule, and was given in the words "Quod rogaret Deum ut indulgeret ei, et nos remittimus vobis, et frater capellanus absolvet vos;" and he was borne out in this assertion by Barton and others of the Templars who were in Holy Orders. Nevertheless, it appears that some of the knights (and presumably many more of the serving-brothers) confounded this pardon with sacramental absolution, fancying, in the words of Brother Walter Clifton before the Bishop of St. Andrews, that "the Lord Pope had granted this power of old to the Grand Master." Singularly enough, of all the charges adduced, this strange error was the only one which the Bishop of London, who had watched the proceedings throughout, held to be positively proved.

Indeed, the inquisitors were in an awkward position. The Templars had sent a protest to the Archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans, in which they declared that they had always adhered to the Catholic Faith and to their monastic vows, and "denied and firmly contradicted, for all and for each, that

* Gonaville had been received in London.

they had fallen into any heresy or evil-doing.”* The evidence, when sifted, certainly tends towards acquittal; if any doubt remained, the accused should have had the benefit. But the bishops were in some sort under the necessity of finding an open verdict. The Order was about to be destroyed; moreover, Edward II., always under somebody’s domination, was now dragged in the wake of his strong and turbulent father-in-law. As a sort of compromise the Bishop of London demanded that the Templars should be reconciled and absolved under the following form:

Since thou dost confess thyself to have erred grievously concerning the Sacrament of Penance, and to have been accused in the Apostolic Bulls of heretical depravity which thou canst not disprove, and since thou askest the mercy of the Church, we absolve thee, &c.

A number of the brethren—how many we do not know†—assented to this form, and were reconciled at the western doors of St. Paul’s and of “St. Marie Berking Church.” They were then dispersed among different monasteries, where they led edifying lives; their maintenance being charged on their own forfeited manors.

One is sorry to have to add that the more heroic spirits, those who persisted in declaring that they could not abjure errors which they had never committed, were condemned to irons “in vilissimo carcere.” Among them was the Grand Commander, William de la More. His captivity, however, was not of long duration; he died in the Tower early in 1313.‡

It has generally been taken for granted that the property of the Temple, at least in England, was made over to the Knights of St. John. But the records tell a different tale. Some, indeed, of the numerous manors were granted to the Hospital, but others remained in the king’s hands and were bestowed by him on different nobles. The Earl of Pembroke, for instance, was grantee of all the property of the Order in London and

* The four knights especially deputed to defend the Order in France made a similar protest, full of the purest Catholic doctrine.

† Death would appear to have been busy among them, for at this time there were only eight in Aldgate, and none in the other gates and the extemporised prisons.

‡ His maintenance, like that of the other prisoners, had been charged on the manors.

the suburbs,* except the Temple itself, which was made over to the lawyers.

In Aragon, where the knights long defended themselves in their fortresses, in Castile, Portugal, and the Archbishopric of Mayence, the trial of the Order resulted in acquittal. Yet the Temple was doomed. Clement V., striving even now to save the Order and to protect the persons of the knights, was accused of being bribed; was told that “le Pape n’est pas infaillible en matière de foi;”† and that “he sinned through ignorance” in deferring the abolition of the Order of the Temple. In the meanwhile Philip IV. had abated nothing of his inhuman persecution. Several times new articles were brought forward against the Templars, each more outrageous, not to say impossible, than the last.‡ Strange forms of torment were used to extort confessions, and the Sacraments were refused to those who died in prison of their injuries and privations. In city and meadow, beside the silver Seine, amid the orchards of the Dombes and the vines of Champagne, arose the funeral pyres of the children of St. Bernard. At St. Germain fifty-six perished together by slow fire. They were offered their lives if they would plead guilty while the flames were yet about their feet, but the only answer of each and all was a protest of innocence. They died without a cry or groan, and the only shrieks heard were those of the mothers and sisters who had crowded round urging the victims to confess—Rizpahs who were yet unable to drive away the vultures.

The Grand Master had been brought several times before the three cardinals who acted as the Pope’s commissioners, and had declared that he was there “to defend the Order which had raised him to so great honour.” Yet an unexplained circumstance throws some mystery around the closing scenes of this brave soldier’s death. He is represented in the *procès-verbal* as having pleaded guilty to the first indictment, that of the denial of Christ at receptions. Yet when his own confession was read to him at a subsequent appearance before Cardinals Defarge, Nouelli, and Fréauville, he started, made

* Close Rolls, Edward II.

† Pamphlets quoted by Lavocat.

‡ One of these was the same charge of roasting and eating infants which was brought by the Pagans against the early Christians.

the sign of the Cross several times, and roundly declared that there was treachery. The *procès* does not specify the ground of his protest; but Sismondi infers that de Molay's ignorance of Latin had been taken advantage of, and that he had never made the admissions that were written down in his name. This is a point which will probably never be cleared up, especially as de Molay, when brought before Pope Clement and the king, was strangely flurried and confused. It must be remembered that, though nominally under Clement's protection, the Grand Master was really Philip's prisoner. Who knows what were the dreadful secrets of the French prison-houses? M. Lavocat takes it for granted that de Molay had really pleaded guilty to this charge but had been too much agitated, when before the Pope, to put forward what the author regards as palliating circumstances; and it is true that on one of their interviews Clement remanded him as being temporarily *non compos mentis*. But when we consider Philip's extreme desire for the destruction of his victim, it seems not unfair to suggest that the stratagem of prison drugs may have reduced de Molay to this state. Certain it is that on March 18, 1313, when he had been condemned to perpetual imprisonment and had been produced on a scaffold at Paris, together with de Charnay, commander of Normandy, to hear the sentence publicly read, both prisoners denied or retracted their confessions. The Cardinal-commissioners thereupon remanded them till the morrow; but there was to be no morrow for the two knights. On that same day, "at the hour of vespers," de Molay and de Charnay were burned on the Ile des Griefs by Philip's command; and chroniclers agree in saying that they endured their last agony valiantly, protesting to the end their own innocence and that of the Order.

The people gathered up their ashes as the relics of martyrs. Indeed, it is impossible to believe that the Templars were unloved of the French populace. They were accused of avarice, but they continued to give large alms. In one day, during a recent scarcity in Normandy, the knights had fed over eleven thousand poor. Their enemies were of the great ones of the earth.

Already the Grand Master had survived the Order. In 1311 a council composed of three hundred bishops met at Vienne,

partly for the very purpose of trying the cause of the Temple, yet all the knights who presented themselves "for the defence of the Order" were thrown into prison unheard. On March 6, 1312, Clement V. solemnly suppressed the Order. But the very language of his proclamation bespoke him still unconvinced. He declared that

the confessions obtained, the offences divulged therein, the suspicions raised, above all the accusations brought against the Order by the prelates, dukes, counts, barons, and commonalty of France, had caused a scandal which could not be allayed while the Order continued to exist. Therefore he suppressed it by his sovereign power, and not by a definite sentence, which he could not lawfully pronounce after the inquisitions and proceedings recently held.

Philip IV. respected ecclesiastical law sufficiently to make over, nominally at least, the estates of the Temple to the Knights Hospitallers; but he taxed and mulcted them so heavily in the transfer that the Hospital found itself a good deal the poorer for its inheritance.

The ransacking of the treasures and sacristies *ipso facto* disproved the charge of idol-worship, which was one of the most serious crimes imputed to the Templars. Neither in France nor in England had they had time to put their affairs in order before their arrest, yet in neither country was an idol of any sort discovered. The treasury of the Paris Temple did indeed reveal a silver gilt head, but it contained part of a female skull, supposed to be a relic of one of the virgins of Cologne. As to the ridiculous charge of the adoration of a cat, it was but a part of the general incrimination of the Templars as Gnostics. They could but deny it; such a charge was impossible to disprove. I am aware that it used to be said (and Hallam credited the assertion) that Gnostic symbols, including the *gattus niger*, were found in the churches of the Templars, and in other mediæval churches; but modern archæologists dispute the real meaning of the symbols in question. The imputations of immorality may be placed in one category with those brought against the monasteries of England by Henry VIII.; dictated by the same motive, based on no better ground, denied by all the brothers except a few renegades, certainly never proved.

With respect to the denial of Christ at receptions, most

assuredly it was not the general practice of the Order, whose motto was *Malo mori quam negare*, and who had confessed the name of Christ on so many foughten fields. But there is some reason to suppose that it was customary in certain commands, and at the whim of certain commanders, not because they held Our Lord to be a false prophet, nor because of a promise made to a Soldan by a captive Grand Master, according to Galfrid de Gonaville's apocryphal story; but as a test whereby the staunchness of the postulant might be tried.

Such is M. Lavocat's view; but it must be owned that he takes a good deal for granted out of the forced and manipulated confessions of the French torture-chambers. In England, as we have seen, the brethren testified to the reception being *bona ac honesta*, and alike in its ritual in all provinces of the Order. Thus the whole "proven" guilt of the Order is narrowed down to an error of individual brothers concerning the Sacrament of Penance; an error of ignorance which, as one might well think, might have been corrected without chains, prisons, and final degradation.

But the alternatives of innocence or guilt had in reality but little to do with the fate of the Order of the Temple. It had been prejudged, and the mighty fell in unexampled destruction. If it had sinned through pride; if jealousy of rivals had ever dimmed the glory of its deeds of valour in the Christian cause; and if the impersonal selfishness of a *corps d'élite* had in any degree hastened the loss of the Holy Land to Christendom, the Order atoned for all defects in that last fiery trial, and vanished from the world in one great martyrdom.

AMY GRANGE.

ART. VI.—THE RESTORATION OF THE HIER- ARCHY AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL.

THE development and expansion of the Catholic Church in England during the present century is due to the action of many causes. Leaving out of consideration the continuous influx of Catholics from the sister Isle, there are three great historical events which have combined their forces to render possible and to forward the wonderful progress of the Church. The Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 removed the civil disabilities under which Catholics had laboured for three centuries. The Oxford Movement of the "forties" wrought a great change in public feeling towards doctrines and religious practices which had long fallen into disuse and disrepute, and at the same time strengthened the Catholic body by the influence and authority of a host of distinguished converts. The altered conditions so produced necessitated numerous administrative changes, especially the restoration of the ordinary form of Church government by bishops, of which the Catholics of England had been deprived since the days of Elizabeth. The logical outcome of the tolerance granted by the Bill of 1829, was that Catholics should be free to practice their religion and to employ all the means at their disposal for its expansion. But Rome, proverbially cautious, refrained from action until the growing necessities of the Church in England clearly demanded a reorganised system of administration, and until there was a fair prospect of the change being at least ignored, if not quietly accepted, by the Government of the day. It is with the history of the manner in which that restoration of Church government was effected, its reason and attendant circumstances, and one of its immediate results, that we propose to deal in the following article.

The first organised system of episcopal government for England was projected by Pope Gregory the Great, who directed St. Augustine to found two archiepiscopal sees, one at

London and the other at York, with twelve suffragans each. The scheme was carried out partly by St. Augustine and partly by Archbishop Theodore, though, after Paulinus, no archbishop sat in the See of York till, by a decree of Pope Gregory III., Bishop Egbert secured the pallium. From St. Augustine's time, bishops in communion with Rome continued to hold rule in England till the sixteenth century, when a breach occurred, which, repaired for a time under Queen Mary, was rendered permanent by Elizabeth's restoration of the Royal Supremacy. Henceforward the Catholics of England had no bishops in ordinary at their head. They were ruled by archpriests from 1598 till 1623. From 1623 till 1688 they were under the guidance of one Vicar-Apostolic. Then four Vicars-Apostolic were appointed to preside respectively over the London, Midland, Northern, and Western Districts.

I.

Constant attempts were made to obtain the constitution of these Vicars-Apostolic as bishops in ordinary, and this was one of the expressed objects in the foundation of the Catholic Committee in 1783. In 1838 the Vicars-Apostolic sent to Rome a body of resolutions—*Statuta Provisoria*—petitions for increased powers by which the Vicars might be raised to the state of Ordinaries; for the erection of Chapters to advise and elect the bishops; and for the appointment of vicars-general, missionary rectors, &c. As their name was meant to imply, the arrangements here suggested were only temporary in their nature and to act as a bridge to a future hierarchy. It was feared, however, that if the *Statuta* were adopted, the hierarchy would be indefinitely postponed. Accordingly, petitions for a hierarchy again flowed in, but nothing was done by Rome at the time except to increase the number of Vicars-Apostolic from four to eight.

But the movement for a hierarchy was now fairly afoot. Dr. Rock, the antiquarian, espoused it warmly. A priests' club, called "The Adelphie," was founded in London, and there the matter was discussed and urged, till it was at last taken up by the press in "The Catholic Magazine." In the spring of 1845, Bishop Griffiths proposed to the Vicars-Apostolic

a petition to Rome, begging that the Vicars-Apostolic might be changed into titular bishops, and also drew up, for the benefit of the authorities in Rome, a list of reasons for and against the measure. Two years later, in the April of 1847, a seven days' meeting of the bishops took place. It was an anxious council. Unfavourable representations of the English clergy had been made to Rome by Italian priests who did not understand the country; complaints and appeals against the Vicars-Apostolic were frequent. The position of the Vicars-Apostolic was thus one of great difficulty. Two of their number were therefore sent to Rome to explain matters and, at the same time, to feel their way towards a re-establishment of the hierarchy as the only effectual means of restoring good order. This brings us to what may be regarded as the first real negotiation for a restored hierarchy.

The need for such a measure was indeed pressing. The only code of government then possessed by English Catholics was a constitution issued in 1753 by Pope Benedict XIV., which was based on a state of affairs that was now passed away. It was grounded on the following considerations:

1. That English Catholics were under penal laws and enjoyed no liberty of conscience.
2. That their colleges were abroad.
3. That there were no religious houses in England.
4. That there were no congregational churches, but only private chapels served by the chaplains of noblemen, at which the faithful might attend.

In this way, what had been a direction was now obsolete, and instead of being a help, was rather an embarrassment and a clog. Besides, as we have already seen, the status of the Vicars-Apostolic was one of great difficulty and of little or no authority. They had no power to legislate for local wants in the light of local experience by corporate action. Furthermore, the clergy were aggrieved; they had no representative voice in the nomination of their bishops; they were without laws to regulate, on a satisfactory footing, the mutual relations of authority and obedience. Naturally, therefore, complaints and appeals to Rome were many and distressing. The laity, too, could not but feel the reproaches flung at them by their fellow-countrymen that a hierarchy dared not be given to

them, and that the Apostolic descent lay with the Protestant prelates.

On the other hand, the difficulties in the way of the re-establishment of hierarchy were considerable. There was the question of the maintenance of the bishops; the difficulty of finding suitable men from a limited clergy; the question of the local titles of the proposed bishops; the fear of clashing with the English law, and of rousing unnecessarily any bad feeling in England; and lastly, there were the objections put forward by those Catholics who opposed the measure.

Bishops Wiseman and Sharples arrived in Rome in July. There they immediately drew up a memorial of the work done in England during the last six years, to combat the accusations of want of zeal that had been made against the bishops. This was pronounced to be entirely satisfactory. Then, in conference with Mgr. Palma at Propaganda, it was determined that the time had come for a new constitution for the organisation of the Church in England, to supersede the out-of-date regulations of Benedict XIV. To this, however, Bishop Wiseman was opposed. After all, it could only result in a provisional arrangement which would be as troublesome as a restoration of the hierarchy. The Vicars-Apostolic at home supported Bishop Wiseman's contention; and Mgr. Barnabo, pro-secretary of Propaganda, on hearing of the difficulties, said: "You will always have these troubles and questions until you obtain a hierarchy. Ask for it, and I will support your petition."

A petition for the re-establishment of the hierarchy was accordingly drawn up, and presented to the Pope, Pius IX., who declared himself satisfied on the question. Objections, however, were raised, according to custom, in order that they might be met at the outset. Cardinal Acton had objected that a hierarchy would render Catholics in England less loyal to the Holy See. The two bishops triumphantly disposed of this by pointing out that the English were the only nation who had given martyrs, many and illustrious, for the rights and supremacy of the Holy See. Cardinal Castracane also brought forward the point that if Lingard's "*History of England*" were a true one, it was clear that "we had always been a nation inclined to withstand authority." His Eminence, how-

ever, agreed that, if the other Cardinals approved, he would waive his objection and vote with them.

But a delay now arose, owing to troubles in Italy, which sent Bishop Wiseman to England on a diplomatic mission to the Government. Then Bishop Griffiths died, and Bishop Wiseman was appointed pro-Vicar-Apostolic for the London district. In October, a letter was received by the bishops from Propaganda, asking for a joint scheme for the restoration of the hierarchy on the principle of redistribution of the eight vicariates into twelve dioceses. The Vicars-Apostolic met in London on the 11th of September, and drew up a plan which somehow or other never reached Rome. No more was heard until they again met in London in the May of 1848. They were overwhelmed with difficulties. Famine and fever were abroad in the land; the Northern and Midland vicariates were vacant; many able priests had fallen victims to the fever; and there were three troublesome cases of appeal by priests. Bishop Ullathorne was therefore sent to Rome, as the representative of his brother bishops, to hasten the settlement of the appeals, the filling up of the vacant vicariates, and the re-establishment of the hierarchy.

Dr. Ullathorne arrived in Rome on May 27th. The delay that had occurred was explained by Mgr. Barnabo as having arisen from the difficulty of settling the proper person for the office of archbishop. A congregation for the discussion and settlement of the hierarchy question had already been appointed, and was to assemble in June, provided a plan could be suggested for filling up the London and Midland Vicariates. Dr. Ullathorne therefore drew up two memorials: one suggesting that Bishop Walsh, preparatory to being made archbishop, should be transferred from the Midland district to London, with Bishop Wiseman as his coadjutor; the second proposing to meet the difficulties of episcopal maintenance and of finding suitable men from a small body of clergy, by filling up the existing vacancies, by changing the Vicars-Apostolic into titular bishops, and by leaving the new dioceses, formed by redistribution of the old vicariates, under the temporary administration of neighbouring bishops.

The Congregation of Cardinals met on the 26th of June. The two memorials enabled a favourable decision to be arrived

at, but further information was required upon the question of the titles, limits, &c., of the dioceses, the division of London, and a bishop for the Midland district. Bishop Ullathorne replied by four memorials. The first treated of the change of the Vicars-Apostolic into Ordinaries. The second recommended Dr. Hendren, a Franciscan, as bishop of the Western district, which had always been in the hands of the regular clergy. The third document drew out a suggested plan for the redistribution of the eight vicariates into twelve dioceses which was accepted and afterwards incorporated in the Letters Apostolic re-establishing the hierarchy. Lancashire was subsequently subdivided, thus raising the number of dioceses to thirteen. The fourth memorial discussed the question of the titles of the new sees; and recommended that the greater part of the titles should be taken from populous localities, where there were no existing Anglican titles, or where some other title could be adopted. This was suggested in order to avoid any conflict with English law and to keep within the restrictions of the Emancipation Bill of 1829, for which, in 1845, Lord John Russell had declared he could conceive no good ground.

At the second meeting of the cardinals, which took place on July 17th, all was approved and settled, with the exception of the titles, on which the cardinals desired to consult the personal feelings of each bishop. Dr. Ullathorne therefore proposed to return home and meet the assembled hierarchy at the opening of the Salford Cathedral. Meanwhile, the Pontifical decree had been prepared, with spaces for the titles; the historical preface being by Mgr. Palma, from materials supplied by Dr. Grant, rector of the English College in Rome, whilst the body of the document was the work of Cardinal Vizzardelli.

These negotiations were known in England without awakening any offence in the papers. In a discussion in Parliament on August 17th, Lord J. Russell declared "that it would be very foolish to take means of great vigour or energy to prevent the Pope from communicating with the Catholics of this country." No support or recognition would be given to the new bishops; but here was a declaration, bearing out the force of the oath prescribed for Catholics in the Emancipation

Act, that the action of the Pope with regard to English Catholics was free.

Further political troubles, however, had arisen in Italy to delay the accomplishment of the measure. In November 1848, the Pope had been compelled to fly from Rome to Gaeta. Rome was in the hands of the revolutionists. Order was not restored till the April of 1850 when the Pope returned to his own city. Late in the summer of that year, the discussion of the English hierarchy question was resumed, and resulted in a unanimous petition from the Cardinals of the Congregation for the issue of the brief. There was another difficulty now in the way. Bishop Walsh of London had died in the February of 1849, and Bishop Wiseman was Vicar-Apostolic of the London district. The Pope had determined to confer the cardinal's hat upon Bishop Wiseman, a course which would necessitate his removal from London to Rome. For a cardinal could not be a Vicar-Apostolic; he could not live in England merely as a cardinal under Vicars-Apostolic; and it was feared that his residence in England might irritate the feelings of Protestants or clash with the law of the land. News of this promotion leaked out in July. In August Dr. Wiseman had an interview with Lord John Russell, at which he communicated to him his appointment and his future destination as Librarian of the Vatican Library. The leave-taking was friendly and cordial on both sides.

This removal of Bishop Wiseman, however, seemed nothing short of a calamity to the English Bishops, and strong representations were immediately made to Rome of the injury that must result to the cause of Catholicity in England. But as things were at the time, the position of a cardinal in England was ecclesiastically impossible.

The only way out of the difficulty was the accomplishment of what had been so long under consideration—the creation of a hierarchy in England, and the sending back of Bishop Wiseman as the head of it. This latter course was gladly hailed by all parties. We have already seen how careful Rome had been, in all previous negotiations, not to ruffle English feeling, or to violate English law. Now again, at the last moment, and in the same spirit of anxiety, Sir George Bowyer, a Catholic barrister of some fame, was called in and

asked, amongst other things : 1. Whether it was unlawful for a cardinal to reside in England ? 2. Whether the creation of Roman Catholic diocesan bishops was contrary to the law of the land ? To both these questions, he and the others consulted were unanimous in returning a direct negative. At last, therefore, all was clear, and so, on September 29th, 1850, the Letters Apostolic, re-establishing a Catholic hierarchy in England, were promulgated.

In these letters, following on the historical introduction, comes the effective portion, couched in these words :

Wherefore, after having duly considered the whole matter, of our own motion and certain knowledge, and out of the plenitude of our Apostolical authority, we decree and ordain that in the Kingdom of England shall again flourish according to the laws of the Church, the hierarchy of bishops in ordinary, who shall take their titles from the Sees which we appoint by these presents in the districts of the several Vicars-Apostolic.

The sees and their extent are then described in detail.

At a consistory held on the following day, Bishop Wiseman was created a cardinal priest and, on October 3, received the cardinal's hat, with the title of St. Pudentiana, demanding at the same time the pall as Archbishop of Westminster. Four days later, on October 7, His Eminence, still in Rome, issued, out of the Flaminian gate, the gate looking towards his own See of Westminster, a pastoral letter addressed to the clergy and laity of his new archdiocese. Naturally this pastoral took a jubilant tone. It bore tidings of success after long anxiety and discussion—tidings of a new departure which seemed to open a vast prospect of success in promoting the cause of God in this country. After greeting his flock and tracing in outline the plan of the restored hierarchy, His Eminence continued :

The great work then is complete ; what you have long prayed for and desired is granted. Your beloved country has received a place among the fair churches, which, normally constituted, form the splendid aggregate of the Catholic communion. Catholic England has been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament from which its light had long vanished, and begins anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, the source of jurisdiction, of light and of vigour.

The pastoral was published without being communicated to

the English bishops, and along with the Letters Apostolic, quickly found its way into *The Times* and other papers. The storm of furious indignation that the publication of these letters aroused throughout the country was as violent as it was unexpected. There had been no premonitory rumblings, no warnings of an eruption. On the contrary, as we have seen, ministers had expressed no objections when the matter of the proposed hierarchy was brought before them; it would be ignored and so be tolerated. The press had remained silent. Now, however, the sleeping dogs began to howl and bark. That they were baying the innocent moon did not render their bark the less vicious or uproarious. On October 19th, the attack was thus opened by a leader in *The Times*:

We respect the sanctity of religious opinions, we recognise the inviolable rights of conscience under every form of worship, and we profess the liberal opinion of the age we live in, that no civil disabilities ought to be annexed to religious distinctions.

But with due deference to all this, we must reject this

attempt of a foreign power to fasten its authority on our divisions, and resist the construction of those great engines of the Romish hierarchy which it is the great glory of our forefathers to have expelled and overthrown. . . . Is it here in Westminster that an Italian priest is to employ the renegades of our National Church to restore a foreign usurpation?

Again, on the 22nd of October, the same journal thundered forth a description of the papal documents as

documents proceeding from a foreign Government, [and evidencing] an audacious and conspicuous display of pretensions to resume the absolute spiritual dominion of this island which Rome has never abandoned.

But even in the midst of such denunciation it was compelled to admit that

the letter of the law which prohibits Roman Catholic prelates from assuming the titles of the Anglican bishops has been obeyed, whilst its spirit has been set at defiance.

On the 24th it returned to the same subject as follows:

For the objects of spiritual domination and government, these seditious synods, these fictitious dioceses and these indefinite episcopal powers are

avowedly intended to carry on a more active warfare against the liberties and the faith of the people of England.

It would be difficult to imagine anything further from a true view of the case than this. The ordinary language of legal documents, the exuberant joy in the tone of the Cardinal's pastoral were perverted into the language of aggression, an attack on the laws and liberties of England, an insult to our Gracious Sovereign still happily reigning, a daring display of Romish ambition, and all the other thousand and one epithets which can be picked up to be flung as dust from the highway into the eyes of those who pass.

Perhaps we may be pardoned if, in order to convey an idea of the hubbub of indignation that arose, we make a few more quotations from the papers of the day. Said the *Morning Post* :

To create a cardinal-archbishop of Westminster, and to nominate bishops over the land with titles of honour and conditions of precedence, is itself a direct invasion of the royal authority, and an attack on the constitution of 1688.

"The insult which is thus offered to the English nation is aimed against both Church and State," chimed in the *Morning Herald* ; whilst the *Spectator* found consolation in the following :

We believe Popery cannot live in the free atmosphere of England, now becoming freer every day. Popery cannot breathe the same air with natural philosophy, with natural theology, nor with anything else that is free as the sun and the wind.

Unfortunately for this, the *Daily News* thought otherwise :

The fact is, the country is in progress of being sold to Rome by the very institutions and the very guardians which the State has appointed and privileged and endowed. It has been their pinguity, their monopoly, their over-bred distaste and aversion for all that is popular in religion that has produced the opposite extreme ; and that opposite extreme turns out to be popery.

To counteract such declarations as these, Bishop Ullathorne published in *The Times* of October 22nd a letter deprecating the agitation and explaining that the Pope's action was concerned solely with spiritual matters and with the Pope's own

spiritual subjects, who, in all temporal concerns, were subject to and guided by the laws of the land. At St. Chad's, Birmingham, on the 27th of the same month, Dr. Newman preached a sermon on the subject of the restored hierarchy, entitled "Christ upon the Waters."

Meanwhile, Cardinal Wiseman was coming leisurely home. On November 3rd, he wrote from Vienna to Lord John Russell, assuring him that he had not imagined, in August, that he would return to England, and lamenting the erroneous and even distorted view which the English press had taken of the recent action of the Pope, and explaining that he himself was invested with a dignity purely spiritual.

Unfortunately, however, whilst this conciliatory letter was on its way, Lord John Russell, on November 4th, was busy with the composition of a letter to the Bishop of Durham, which has since become historical as *The Durham Letter*. The salient points of that letter are contained in, and its tone may be judged from, the following extracts :

MY DEAR LORD,—I agree with you in considering the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism as insolent and insidious, and I therefore feel as indignant as you can upon the subject. . . . There is an assumption of power in all the documents which have come from Rome—a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England, and a claim to sole and undivided sway which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation as asserted even in Catholic times.

I confess, however, that my alarm is not equal to my indignation. . . . No foreign prince or potentate will be permitted to fasten his fetters upon a nation which has so long and so nobly vindicated its rights to freedom of opinion, civil, political, and religious.

Upon this subject then I will only say that the present state of the law shall be carefully examined, and the propriety of adopting any proceedings with reference to the recent assumption of power deliberately considered." . . . The letter concludes by declaring that "the danger to be apprehended from a foreign prince of no great power is nothing to the danger within the gates, from the unworthy sons of the Church of England herself."

This letter was an unconcealed ebullition of temper from the Prime Minister of England sitting in Downing Street.* Its

* *Punch* described Lord John Russell's action as follows :—

"Little John Russell

Got in a bustle

At hearing the general cry ;

appearance in the papers fanned the flames of intolerance and religious bigotry that were already leaping and roaring over the face of the country. Few more unfortunate or ill-timed declarations have ever fallen from a responsible Minister in modern times. Just when the nation was settling down to peace, when by the labours of his predecessors and partly even of himself, the law had become just, "he took advantage of his great position to rouse up the spirit of strife and hate among us, and to quicken into active life the demon of persecution" ("Roebuck's Letter," December 2). As Mr. Bright afterwards declared in Parliament: The least that could be said about the letter was that it had been penned under "feelings of excitement which were hardly becoming in a Prime Minister." However, the Minister's word had gone forth into the ears of the nation; he had in his loudest tones "cried, havoc! and let slip the dogs of war." Every petty persecutor, every zealot against Rome, every hater of all things Romish, every mob orator desirous of making political capital, joined in the hue and cry, knowing that they had the Prime Minister at their back.

Naturally, the 5th of November afforded such people a splendid opportunity of giving vent to their anti-Catholic prejudice. *The Times* of November 6th, 1850, contains reports of the Gunpowder Plot sermons which were all plainly and indignantly directed against this figment of the Papal aggression. In the Guy Fawkes's processions, effigies of the Pope and cardinals were substituted for the usual guys. Men carrying brushes and bowls of whitewash inscribed walls and pavements with "No Popery! No wafer gods! No Catholic humbug!" In a procession that passed through some of the streets of London there were fourteen guys; one of them, 16 feet high, representing Cardinal Wiseman between an impudent nun and a fat monk. In another, the effigy was dubbed "St. Guy the Martyr!"; whilst another was labelled, "Cardinal St. Impudence, going to take possession of Westminster." Similar demonstrations were held at Salisbury, Ware, Peckham, amid the ringing of church bells, and to the strains of the "Rogues' March."

So a letter wrote he
In the popular key,
And said 'What a good boy am I!'

The agitation was not, however, confined to popular celebrations. Words tending to excite and inflame the worst feelings of intolerance were uttered in high and responsible quarters. The Rev. Dr. Cumming lectured at Hanover Square Rooms on November 7th. Having engaged in prayer, he proceeded to describe the Pope as

the man of sin, the head of the apostasy, the head of that system which was designated in the Scriptures as the mystery of iniquity, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and the abomination of the earth who had had the boldness to insult our Queen, our Church, our religion.

He concluded his address by quoting Shakespeare to the effect—

That no Italian priest
Shall tythe or toll in our dominions.

On November 11th came the Ministerial Banquet at the Mansion-House. There, the Lord Chancellor of these realms, forgetting, in the fury of the storm, the impartial solemnity due to his office, in a reply to the toast with which his name had been coupled, "hurled his award against us from behind the tables of good fellowship and the anti-popish cheers of civic grandees." After words in praise of the Established Church, and in condemnation of the enemies that beset her from within and from without, he said :

The hymn of triumph for the admission to equality in civil liberty has given place to the note of insult, triumph and domination, announcing that you have come under a Roman Catholic hierarchy. Considering the language to which I refer, it would seem as if some were acting in anticipation of the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy which presents a cardinal's hat as equal to the Crown of the Queen of England. If such be anticipated, I answer them in the language of Gloster.

Under our feet we'll stamp thy Cardinal's hat
In spite of pope or dignities of Church.

Lord John Russell also declared from the same place : "It will be my duty to maintain to the utmost of my power the supremacy of our Sovereign."

Amongst these expressions of responsible opinion must certainly be numbered and recorded a few specimens from the

charges delivered to their clergy by the bishops of the Establishment.

London described the action of Rome as "an insult to the sovereign . . . a most wanton and insolent aggression," and spoke of the "spurious and schismatical hierarchy." *His Grace of York* talked of "intolerable and usurped authority"; of "this novel and daring violation of ecclesiastical law, this insulting and presumptuous intrusion." *St. David's* had "feelings of contemptuous pity" for what *Exeter* alluded to as "a daring display of Romish ambition," and which *Bath and Wells* denounced as "an act disgraceful to a minister of Christ." The clergy in return addressed their bishops; in fact it seemed to be a time for everybody to address everybody else. Addresses also poured in to the Queen from all quarters. To these her Majesty replied in general terms, and in words which showed that she was in a sphere far removed from the storms of bigotry that were swirling around her. Cardinal Wiseman, in his second lecture at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, on December 15th, thus described those answers:

A voice has been heard from the Throne, gentle yet firm, as becomes a Queen's, a voice that gives assurance of justice to the assailed, and security of equal rights to all.

A whirlwind of fury, described as follows by Cardinal Wiseman, swept over the country:

Sarcasm, ridicule, satire of the broadest character, theological and legal reasonings of the most refined nature, bold and reckless, earnest and artful argument—nothing seemed to come amiss; and every invocable agency, from the Attorney-General to Guy Fawkes, from *præmunire* to a hustling, was summoned forth to aid the cry and administer to the vengeance of those who raised it.*

To meet all this agitation an address of loyalty, composed by Cardinal Wiseman, and signed by the Catholics of England, was presented to her Majesty. The Cardinal also now threw himself into the newspaper war that was raging, and on the 20th of November issued, in a pamphlet of thirty-two pages, "An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the subject of the Catholic Hierarchy." It was printed in full in the *Times* of the same day. The day after,

* Introduction to Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal."

the same newspaper, climbing gently down from its previous position, congratulated His Eminence, in a lengthy leader, on his recovery of the use of the English language, and avowed a wish that he had spoken more plainly before. It then proceeded, however, to show that

The Roman Catholic Church has two languages—one of more than mortal arrogance and insolence, the other, artful, humble, and cajoling, but behind it all, ever of the same stern unbending spirit.

A brief *resumé* of this justly famous appeal must necessarily find a place here.

After an introduction sketching the history of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England from 1623 to 1850, and of the frequent requests for bishops with the full knowledge of the responsible Ministers of the time, the Appeal opens with a short description of the agitation that had sprung up against the recent action of Rome. His Eminence then goes on to show—first, that the Queen appoints bishops whom those who do not believe in them need not obey, and that the denial of the royal supremacy is no offence at common law; secondly, that only the taking of the names of existing Protestant sees, deaneries, &c., was forbidden by the Emancipation Act; thirdly, that as we could only get our hierarchy from the Pope we had a right to appeal to him for it; fourthly, he shows that, as the law declares the Pope has no power in England, the spiritual acts of the Pope do not come under the cognizance of the law, and that therefore bishops may be appointed and take titles, not forbidden by law, without any infringement of the law; fifthly, it was demonstrated that the mode of establishing the hierarchy had been neither insolent nor insidious, for the same had been already done in the colonies and acknowledged by the authorities, whilst the whole history of the recent restoration showed that ministers had been cognisant of what was going on; sixthly, it was explained that Westminster was taken as the title of the metropolitan, partly from necessity, as London was already the title of a Protestant see, and Southwark a separate Catholic see, and partly also to avoid giving offence. Then followed the conclusion of the appeal, pointing to the part of Westminster which alone the Cardinal covets, bewailing the action of the Protestant clergy, and

thanking the people of England in general, and Catholics in particular, for their forbearance. From this peroration, probably the most forcible passage the Cardinal ever penned, we quote the following :

Yet this splendid monument, its treasures of art, and its fitting endowments form not the part of Westminster which will concern me. For there is another part which stands in frightful contrast, though in immediate contact, with this magnificence. . . . Close under the Abbey of Westminster there lie concealed labyrinths of lanes and courts, alleys and slums, nests of ignorance, vice, depravity and crime, as well as of squalor, wretchedness, and disease ; whose atmosphere is typhus, whose ventilation is cholera ; in which swarm a huge and almost countless population, in great measure, nominally at least, Catholic ; haunts of filth which no sewage committee can reach—dark corners, which no lighting board can brighten. This is the part of Westminster which alone I covet, and which I shall be glad to claim and to visit as a blessed pasture in which sheep of Holy Church are to be tended. . . . Thanks to you, brave and generous and noble-hearted people of England who would not be stirred up by those whose duty it is to teach you gentleness, meekness and forbearance, to support what they call a religious cause by irreligious means ; and would not hunt down when bidden your unoffending fellow-citizens, to the hollow cry of No Popery, and on the pretence of a fabled aggression.

On this whole noble passage from which we quote, a writer, analysing and commenting on the Appeal over the *nom-d'emprunt* of "John Bull," remarked :

If this passage is too good for an archbishop, the anomaly may be accounted for by the fact that he is poor and cannot afford to be stupid.

The Spectator of November 23 declared :

Whether confuting the Premier on grounds of political precedent, meeting ecclesiastical opponents with appeals to principles of spiritual freedom, rebuking a partisan judge, or throwing sarcasm at the indiffusive wealth of a sacred establishment which has become literally hedged from the world by barriers of social depravity, he equally shows himself the master of dialectical resource.

The London News of the same date sorrowfully assured its readers :

The appeal is so temperate, so logical as to increase the public regret that it did not appear a month ago, before the mischief was done, and before this angry flood of theological bitterness was let loose over the land.

Atlas declared that Cardinal Wiseman was "at once the most polite and astute reasoner of his time"; whilst *The Morning Chronicle* (November 21) regretted that

The false position taken up by the Prime Minister should have enabled Cardinal Wiseman to assume, with so much plausibility and success, the defensive position of the representatives of an injured and insulted community.

It will be evident from quotations such as these, which might be multiplied indefinitely, that the appeal was not without its effect. It pierced opponents panoplied in defective armour, and where it failed to convince, it at least succeeded in extorting the tribute of unwilling admiration. But His Eminence did not rest content. On December 8th, he commenced a course of three lectures on the Catholic hierarchy at St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, in order to console and fortify his own immediate subjects.

However, in spite of all attempts to stem the tide of violent feeling that had been aroused by a mistaken press, by a Minister appalled by the fear of losing office, and by an episcopate alarmed for its undisturbed comfort, the hideous agitation went on through all the dark days of December and of January. Addresses continued to pour in to the Ministry and to the Crown. Expectation rose on tiptoe as the time for the opening of Parliament approached. The Prime Minister had declared in the Durham letter that "the law should be examined, and that the propriety of adopting any proceedings with reference to the recent assumptions of power should be deliberately considered." Would the Minister fulfil his threat? The agitation over the so-called Papal aggression had at first fallen into the hands of the press, and of the clergy of all denominations, who had treated it from a point of view natural enough to a clerical eye, as a conflict between rival religions struggling for the mastery over the consciences of their congregations. Then it had fallen into the hands of the lawyers, whose profession led them to view it as a problem involving many points of antiquarian and historical interest. Was it now about to enter on a third stage of existence? Was it, in obedience to popular clamour, roused by the indiscreet indignation of a Minister of the Crown, now about to be forced under the jurisdiction of Parliament, whose power is not only to

discuss, but to determine? There was anxiety in some quarters, but for the most part the future policy of the Government was a foregone conclusion.

II.

These hopes and expectations were not disappointed. On February 4, 1851, Parliament was opened by the Queen in person. The Queen's Speech, after alluding to difficulties attending the land question, proceeded as follows :

The recent assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles, conferred by a foreign Power, has excited strong feelings in this country, and large bodies of my subjects have presented addresses to me expressing attachment to the throne, and praying that such assumptions should be resisted. I have assured them of my resolution to maintain the rights of my Crown, and the independence of the nation against all encroachment, from whatever quarter it may proceed. I have at the same time expressed my earnest desire and firm determination, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired the religious liberty which is so justly prized by the people of this country. It will be for you to consider the measure which will be laid before you on this subject.

This, of course, was the signal for the fray in Parliament. After a spirited protest against the projected legislation by Lord Stanley, the Lords agreed to the Address; but in the Commons, it was made the subject of a warm and prolonged debate of three days. Mr. Roebuck, M.P. for Sheffield, rose immediately after the seconder of the Address, and denounced the agitation in all its aspects.

To say to the Catholics that they shall not have bishops who derive their power from the Pope of Rome, is to say to them—you shall not have bishops to confer on you the spiritual comforts of your religion. In other words, it is gross persecution. . . . I charge the noble lord with dealing falsely on the present occasion with the people of this country. . . . Does anybody believe that the Catholics of England, who are amongst the most peaceable and submissive of all classes of her Majesty's subjects, and who are, I will say, too humble, of all persons in the world should be accused of making inroads upon her Majesty's prerogative, because Dr. Wiseman is called Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. There is no meaning in this word aggression; the contest is wholly one as to the spiritual influence of the Pope. I would treat alike the Catholic who bows to the Pope, the Methodist who bows to Conference, and the Episcopalian who does not bow to anybody, but bows to

this House. For eventually, this House governs the kingdom: the Queen's supremacy is the supremacy of the Minister, and that means the opinion of this House.

Lord John Russell assured the House of the sincerity of his letter to the Bishop of Durham, reminded them of Rome's aggressive spirit in matters temporal as well as spiritual, and gave notice of the Bill he would introduce upon the subject of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

In pursuance of this notice, the Prime Minister, on February 7th, rose to move for leave to bring in a Bill "to prevent the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom." Cardinal Wiseman was present under the Gallery.

Declaring that he was acting under a full consciousness of his responsibility, Lord John Russell pointed to a recent synod at Thurles against the godless colleges, to the unchanging aggressive spirit of Rome, the anti-Roman legislation in Catholic countries and in bygone England, and to the fact that Rome's recent action was an interference of ecclesiastical power with the temporal supremacy of the realm. The debate was prolonged until the 14th before the first reading of the Bill was passed. Mr. Roebuck again threw himself into the forefront of the opposition, and was followed by Mr. John Bright. Mr. Bright wondered why the proposed bill was not aimed at that greater danger of the Church of England, the enemies within her own gates—rather than appeal to the bigotry of the country against the Pope. The Bill proposed would be impotent for the object professed. The matter was not worth legislating upon; but if the country was to be affrighted, it was but fair to bring in a more substantial measure. Mr. Disraeli, too, whilst promising to vote for the measure, abused it roundly. "This Bill," he said, "is to combat an aggression. . . . Is a piece of petty persecution the only weapon we can devise on a solemn political exigency of this vast importance?"

On the night of the 14th, the House at last divided. The members were:

For the introduction of the Bill . . .	395
Against " " . . .	63
<hr/>	
Majority	332

The Bill was then ordered to be printed and placed in the hands of members. In its original form it was briefly as follows :

A long preamble cited the Emancipation Bill of 1829 to show that titles of episcopal sees, &c., in the United Kingdom were not to be taken, and that the assumption of other titles from names of places in the Kingdom was also illegal and void, as inconsistent with the rights above rehearsed. Then it was proposed that the following points should be enacted :

1. A penalty of £100 for assuming titles to pretended sees, &c., in the United Kingdom.
2. That all deeds or writings executed by or under the authority of persons using such titles, should be void.
3. That all endowments of such pretended sees, and all gifts in favour of such persons, should enure to Her Majesty, and remain at her disposal ; whilst all powers relating to charitable bequests, &c., vested in such persons, were to be exercised as her Majesty should think fit.
4. That persons liable under the Act might be compelled, in any suit in equity relative to such trusts, to answer upon oath, notwithstanding such liability.

Such, in substance, was the Bill as at first introduced. The preamble contained two falsehoods. First, reciting Section 24 of the Emancipation Bill, it declared that it might be doubted whether the said enactment extended to the assumption of the titles of places, not sees already recognised by law. There never had been any doubt on the subject. The enactment did not extend so far. Secondly, the preamble declared the illegality of the assumption of such titles. On these two false declarations, the first section imposed a fine of £100. Sections 2 and 3 were more serious matters ; interfering, as they did, with the validity of our bishops' signatures, and the charitable bequests made to them in the interests of their office. Section 2 would have cast a slur on all their episcopal acts, their ordinations, the validity of the marriages of their subjects ; whilst Section 3 was directly opposed to the Charitable Bequests Act of 7 & 8 Victoria, by which a Board of Commissioners, composed of 5 Protestants, 5 Catholics and 3 Judges of the Irish Courts of Equity, was appointed to be trustee for any property which might be bequeathed or con-

veyed to it in trust for the Catholic bishops and their successors.

And yet, in the face of all this, speaking on the authority of the preamble, *The Times* of February 18th had the hardihood to declare that the Bill created no new offence, but only imposed a new and moderate penalty for the commission of an old offence ; and consequently that the Bill was a mitigation of the dangers of the position of the Romish hierarchy rather than a penal law.

Lord John Russell had given notice that he would move the second reading of the Bill at an early date. But he had reckoned without his host. Much was to happen before then. The Government were met by two adverse votes. One was directed against their policy of maintaining the taxation of the country in the form then existing. The other was a division in favour of a motion by Mr. Locke, M.P. for East Surrey, who proposed the assimilation of the county with the borough franchise. There was then only one course open to the Ministry so discredited. Russell and his colleagues placed their resignations in the hands of the Queen. Lord Aberdeen and others were asked to form a Ministry, but were unable to do so under the circumstances of the time. It is certain that this ill-starred measure of the Titles Bill was at the bottom of the difficulty. Both Lord Aberdeen and Sir John Graham regarded it as a violation of the principles of toleration. At last, after much hurrying to and fro between Downing Street and the Court, and after much anxious sounding and discussion, the late Government were called upon to step into the breach, and carry on the business of the country as best they could.

Making a virtue of necessity, Lord John Russell determined to push on the legislation upon which there was least disagreement. But even here he was compelled to trim. He therefore gave notice that having been advised by persons of competent authority that the provisions of the Titles Bill might interfere with the ordination of priests and with existing endowments, he would have those provisions re-examined and altered.

The debate on the second reading of the Bill was opened on Friday, March 7, by Sir G. Grey, who explained the modifications introduced by the Government. The main point was

the excision of Clauses 2 and 3, in which form, he declared, the Bill would still "be an unambiguous declaration of Parliament, embodying a national protest against the assumption of ecclesiastical titles." The debate was continued for several days with much spirit and even acrimony on both sides. The Irish members, rallying to the call of Frederick Lucas, the editor of *The Tablet*, opposed the Bill step by step. It was not a little grotesque to find friend and foe in agreement in their scorn for this miserable measure. Adherents and opponents alike regarded it with sneers. To the former it was too weak, to the latter it was a mere piece of unnecessary persecution, and a sad retrogression on the legislation of the last thirty years. Many awful things too were prophesied of the grasping policy that would be pursued by our new bishops.*

A powerful speech against the Bill was made by Mr. Gladstone, then member for Oxford University. "If," said he, "our temporal affairs had been interfered with, redress should be demanded from the Court of Rome, not punishment inflicted on our fellow-countrymen. If, again, the appointment of bishops was of itself a spiritual act, why should the Crown interfere with Catholic bishops; if, on the other hand, it was of itself a temporal act, why exempt the Scotch bishops. If recourse was to be had to forgotten points of law, he protested against the application of such doctrines to one body alone. The Bill before the House said nothing about the foreign power that was supposed to have infringed the rights of the Crown, but imposed, instead, penalties on her Majesty's subjects. It had ever been the moderate party among English

* Lord Ashley quoted Milton:—

"Then they shall seek to avail themselves of names,
Places, and titles, and with these to join
Secular power, though feigning still to act
By spiritual And from that pretence,
Spiritual laws, by carnal power, shall force
On every conscience."

Mr. Walpole deprecated the idea of producing a non-effective measure, and aptly quoted—

"They must not make a scarecrow of the law,
Setting it up to fear the birds of prey,
And let it keep one shape till custom make it
Their perch and not their terror."

Catholics that had wanted bishops in ordinary, and it had been part of Pitt's policy in 1790 to help them." He concluded finely as follows :

England moves slowly but steadily in legislation. We have a function before the nations—to take a step and keep it. . . . Let us show the Pope and the cardinals that we too have a *semper eadem*, and not spend the latter half of the century in repeating Penelope's process work (of undoing what we have done), but without Penelope's purpose.

This speech was delivered on March 25, just before the division upon Lord Arundel's amendment to read the Bill that day six months. The numbers proclaimed by the tellers were :—

Against the amendment	433
For	„	„	.	.	95
					<hr/>
					338

The second reading was therefore carried by a majority of 338. Commenting upon the numbers of this division, *The Times* was compelled to admit :

In spite of this gigantic majority there was no advance towards an ultimate settlement of the question. Although the second reading was carried so triumphantly, the Ministerial Bill has really no supporters.

The truth of this is evident from the severe handling which the Bill received during its long and stormy passage through Committee. At last, however, the third reading was proposed by Lord John Russell on July 4, and was agreed to by a majority of 263 against 46.

During the debate, Mr. Reynolds expressed the general opinion when he had declared that even the noble lord, the head of the Government, could not tell what shape the measure would assume twenty-four hours hence. It was, indeed, a political and religious chameleon. Some discussion ensued as to the title of the Bill. Mr. Grattan proposed that it should be dubbed "A Bill to prevent the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion in the United Kingdom." Mr. Gladstone again siezed the opportunity to denounce it "as the first step backwards to the abyss of persecution. He was not pleading," he said, "for papal bulls, but for the equal religious freedom

of all classes of her Majesty's subjects. The Act as it then stood, saved, by exemption, the bishops of the Episcopal Church of Scotland." "They do not exist," cried a voice. "No," retorted Mr. Gladstone, "not in the eye of the law. Neither do the Catholic bishops. So leave as much existence to the titles of the Roman Catholic bishops."

At length, under the title of "An Act to Prevent the Assumption of certain Ecclesiastical Titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom," the Bill went up to the House of Lords, and was, as a matter of courtesy and custom, read a first time. On Monday, July 22, the second reading was moved by Lord Lansdowne, who admitted that if their lordships did not think they were dealing with the aggression of a foreign power which was dishonourable to the sovereign, they ought to reject the Bill. On the other hand, Lord Aberdeen and the Bishop of Norwich declared that the mere toleration of an Episcopal Church, such as the Catholic, included the liberty to appoint bishops, to determine their number and rank, and to bestow upon them any titles that did not infringe on any existing rights. If the Bill were allowed to be anything more than a dead letter, there would be trouble in Ireland. After an adjourned debate the Bill was allowed to be read a second time by a majority of 227 against 38. On July 25, the Lords went into Committee, and on the 29th, on the motion of Lord Lansdowne, passed the third reading without a division. The Royal Assent was given on August 1, the feast of St. Peter's Chains, and so the Bill became part, ever an inoperative part, of the statute law of England.

We have seen the provisions of the Bill as first introduced. It was now barely recognisable as the same measure, so merciless had been the running fire of criticism through which it had had to pass, so pliable had its promoters proved themselves.

The Preamble still cited the Emancipation Act, but declared that there was a doubt whether the passage in question met the case of new titles. Accordingly, it was enacted by Clause 1 that all letters apostolical, briefs, &c., as well as the titles and jurisdiction which they conferred, were illegal and void. By Clause 2, all persons who procured, published, or used such briefs, and all who assumed the titles conferred by such

briefs, were declared liable to a fine of £100. Clause 3 exempted the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Scotland from the operation of the previous clauses; whilst the Irish Charitable Bequests Act was also exempted by Clause 4.

Such, then, is this ill-starred measure—the offspring either of a Minister's burst of indignation or want of foresight, or which was even, as some have maintained, a preliminary move in a deeply laid scheme of the Whig party to enslave the Church. Early in the debate, Mr. Disraeli had poured scalding scorn upon it as neither asserting nor vindicating a single principle, and as remedying no substantial evil. The Bill was as rickety a piece of legislation as the tottering Ministry that had framed it. Even *The Times* of July 7 was compelled to admit that the "Government had little cause to triumph over its prostrate and humiliated adversaries." In the first place, the prime mover of the Bill had altogether changed it. Then friends and foes had dictated amendments, and enforced them by parliamentary defeats. Yet this disciplinary treatment was meekly accepted by the Ministry, who adhered, not merely to office, but to the principles of an act, of the preamble and two enacting clauses of which they disapproved. If the amendments were trivial, why were they so pertinaciously resisted? If important, how was it they were so easily adopted? Originally a Bill against certain ecclesiastical titles, a clause was withdrawn and an admission made that, for certain purposes, the use of such titles must be permitted. It had been re-cast, battered, and tinkered, till it had lost every vestige of its identity. Surely, the introduction, exclusion, and the reintroduction of principles, as well as the dual designing of its structure, were poor guarantees for the perfection of a measure which had for so many months engrossed the attention of Parliament.

On July 31, *The Times*, bitter as it had been against us, and savagely as it had hounded on the Ministry to persecuting legislation, found itself speaking as follows of the Bill recently passed :

It is an embarrassing compromise between the necessities of self-defence and the maxims of religious liberty. For ourselves, we trust it may remain a dead letter, not from the supineness of the Administration,

but from the prudence of the parties against whom it is directed. We have done little, and that little may become less, but the national resolution has been placed indisputably on record, and the very scantiness of our legislation is the best proof of its equitable intent.

The truth is, the country was ashamed of itself ; the great newspaper was beaten, and was now climbing down. The last words we have quoted were strangely prophetic ; the little *did* become less. From the beginning, the Bill remained a dead letter, and that through no submission on the part of those against whom it had been launched, till, after an unsuccessful effort in 1870, Mr. Gladstone repealed in 1871 the Bill which he had so stoutly resisted in 1851.

J. B. MILBURN.

ART. VII.—THE CHURCH OF BORDEAUX DURING THE LAST CENTURY OF THE ENGLISH DOMINION.*

I.—SOURCES.

LAST year I published in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* a rather extensive review, written for the Catholic Scientific Congress in Brussels, of the administrative and financial organisation of the Diocese of Bordeaux on the eve of the Revolution. This work has suggested to me a monograph of the same nature covering a given period of the Middle Ages.

The latter is a far more difficult undertaking than the former. In my last year's essay I was able to treat my subject exhaustively and to secure perfect exactitude. This time my information contains a number of *lacunæ* to be filled in, and the figures which I give can only be taken approximately. Nevertheless, I have been able to bring forward numerous reliable documents and I have the certainty that the chief lines of the subject are beyond the reach of possible contradiction.

In the first place, I will briefly name the sources from which I have drawn my information.

We have in Bordeaux an immense collection of archives, wherein are found, gathered together in the two series indicated as G and H, nearly all that has survived of the original deeds, accruing from the archives of the ecclesiastical and regular establishments of the ancient Diocese of Bordeaux. It was here that I had chiefly to direct, in the beginning, my researches. Unfortunately, outside of the archives of the archdiocese and of the metropolitan chapter, which are definitely arranged and catalogued, and of the collegiate chapter of St. Seurin-lès-Bordeaux, the inventory of which is still in

* By arrangement, this article by M. le Chanoine Allain, Archivist of the Diocese of Bordeaux, which we hope may be helpful in the study by comparative methods of Medieval Diocesan structure and history, will appear simultaneously in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*.—EDITOR.

the press, a considerable pile of registers and isolated papers relating to other establishments (chapters, parishes, abbeys, priories, and religious houses), is still in the stage of very incomplete arrangement, and many years must elapse before we can have any idea of the unknown riches which it contains. But it so happens that the archives of the archdiocese, in some of the groups of documents of which it is composed, can throw much and very clear light upon many subjects of importance. I will point out in the first place the "Accounts of the Archdiocese," which are almost complete for the period of time of which I am about to write; they are full of references to the secular and regular benefices at that time existing in the diocese, of its administrative divisions, of its titular revenues, of the sources and the importance of those of the archbishops, of their retinue and their mode of living, and of the auxiliaries whom they associated with themselves in its government. We have some of the deeds or charters, both papal and royal, which were conferred upon them; a small number of the registers of their episcopal court; of the dues paid to them for the large amount of land which they possessed and of which they were the overlords; their title-deeds of property, of customs, and of feudal rights. On the other hand we are only imperfectly informed of their synods, their visitations and the part they took in the collation of benefices. We have not any *regesta* of their deeds. Their political actions, however, are better known to us, thanks above all to the large printed collection: Rymer, *Rôles Gascons*; the nine quarto volumes of the collection of the *Archives Municipales de Bordeaux*, and the thirty quarto volumes of the *Archives Historiques de la Gironde*. The archives of the two chapters of St. André and of St. Seurin supply us with reliable data concerning their constitution, their privileges, their revenues, their lands and their jurisdiction both ecclesiastical and civil.

I have, naturally, studied with most minute attention all our books of local history which could be of any real value to the subject, but above all have I applied myself to the study of original documents which have been made use of. I am confident of the accuracy of my statements, and should, I hope, be prepared, if necessary, to bring forward satisfactory proofs for each one of them.

II.—THE DIOCESE.

The *diocesan territory* was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries much the same as it was at the time of the French Revolution. There were always united together under the crozier of one pastor, the two ancient *cities* of the Bituriges Vivisci and the Boians.

Its division into archpresbyteries was made, at the earliest, after the commencement of the sixteenth century, and very probably even later; it continued in substantially the same form as long as the ancient French Church lasted, consisting of eleven divisions at an early period, or reduced to ten by the amalgamation under one archpriest of the two *pagi* of Buch and Born.

To prove the truth of the statistics which follow I have chiefly made use of the plan of contrasting and comparing very minutely the numerous lists of ecclesiastical taxes, which have been preserved for us by the accounts of the archbishopric. I have only admitted into my list of figures those benefices of which the existence is expressly proved by a number of texts all ranging in date from 1350 to 1450. By carefully comparing these with the indications of the *Pouillé du Diocèse de Bordeaux au XVIII. Siècle*, which some years ago I arranged according to the documents of the diocesan archives, I am now able to establish with certitude some very interesting facts.

In the first place the number of parochial divisions did not materially differ at the two epochs which I am comparing. In the eighteenth century 390 parishes and 35 annexes; in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries about 403 parishes and 10 annexes. But my calculation here is not absolutely reliable, for from 1350 to 1450 there were changes caused by union and disunion, and also by the dissolution, either permanent or temporary, of some parishes, caused by the ravages of war, or by epidemics.

Regarding the priories the difference is much more considerable, and we find a more noticeable falling off in proportion as we leave the Middle Ages. In the period from 1342–68, 106 priories, at least, mentioned in our financial documents, and we might add more to the number, both regular and Hospi-

tallers, were founded in the metropolitan city. In the eighteenth century there existed only 61.—what had become of the others? Many of them had been reunited to the neighbouring parishes; and here again the ravages of war, which was almost incessant in the Bordelais country up to the end of the Fronde, had carried on the work of destruction. On the other hand, these establishments, the nature of which was entirely changed by secularisation, the commanderies no longer supplying any real want, were not often able to survive the diminution of their revenues caused by the fall in the value of money, though the amount of the dues remained the same. The same fate befell the various chapelleries, which were almost innumerable in the Middle Ages.

The secular chapters only numbered four (they increased to six a little later on): namely, the metropolitan church of St. André de Bordeaux, and the collegiate ones of St. Seurin-lès-Bordeaux, St. Émilion, and Villandraut.

The diocese possessed at that time its eleven abbeys, for the most part not in a very flourishing condition, but which the Revolution found still existing. In addition to these we must reckon fourteen convents of men and three of women. Also many institutions of the Hospitallers; the learned Baurein puts their number at a hundred: but by the fourteenth century many of them had become simple priories.

Having made these general observations, I will endeavour to describe the diocese, following the topographical order of the archpresbyteries, which, almost in all cases, correspond with the official and very ancient order of the Synodal lists.

1. In the North-West, between the Gironde and the ocean, the archpresbytery of *Lesparre*, whose archpriest was curé of St. Estèphe; his territory comprised more or less all the actual district of Lesparre. It consisted of 39 parishes; 7 priories, 1 of which, Soulac, was conventual; 2 abbeys, St. Pierre de l'Isle and St. Pierre de Verteuil, both belonging to the Canons Regular of St. Augustine; a convent of Franciscan friars at Lesparre; an establishment of Knights Templars at Benon (which, like all others belonging to the Templars, had, after the suppression of the Order, passed into the hands of the Hospitallers), and finally a hospital at Grayan and a house of Hospitallers at Trélody.

2. South of the Archpresbytery of Lesparre was that of *Moulix*. Its archpriest was curé of St. Médard en Jalles; it comprised 27 parishes; 6 simple priories, 1 priory of Hospitallers and 1 house of Templars, at Arsins.

3. The archpresbytery of *Buch-et-Born* had been formed by the reunion of the *pagus Bogeii* and the *pagus Bornensis*; it was the territory of the *civitas* of the Boians, of whom the last historical trace is the mention in the *Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Gallia*. The country of Buch still belongs to the actual diocese of Bordeaux and to the department of Gironde; that of Born, a piece of land of about 45 kilometers from north to south, and from 18 to 20 east to west, along the coast, now belongs to the diocese of Aire in the department of Landes. It is a country of melancholy aspect, consisting of fens, forests, and downs. Its archpriest was curé of Parentis-en-Born; it consisted of 27 parishes, 11 of them in Born and 16 in Buch, and only 2 priories.

4. The archpresbytery of *Cernès*, bordered on the east by the Garonne and the diocese of Bazas, on the south by the same diocese, on the west by the last-mentioned archpresbytery, and on the north by that of Moulix. Its principal place was Gradignan; it consisted of at least 49 parishes and 4 others of which the existence as baptismal churches is doubtful, 5 of them having entirely disappeared, and being only known to us by the accounts of the taxes of the fourteenth century; 12 priories, many of which were originally institutions of the Hospitallers, destined chiefly for the relief of travellers and pilgrims; a secular Chapter composed of a dean and twelve canons, founded by Clement V. at Villandraut, the place of his birth, and definitely organised by a Bull of John XXII. on the 15th January 1316.

5. Having on its western confines the *pagus Sarnensis*, and separated from it by the Garonne, the archpresbytery of *Bénauge*, had eastern frontier adjoining the diocese of Bazas, and its northern frontier the archpresbytery of "Entre-deux-Mers"; it was bordered on the west by the Garonne. It formed a triangle with a base of about 18 kilometers and a height of 28. The country was populous, and the inhabited portions adjoined closely upon each other without interruption. Its chief town was St. Pierre de Loupiac. I reckon in it 47

parishes and 13 priories. That of St. Sauveur at St. Macaire was conventual, of the order of St. Benedict, and had preserved a certain importance all through the Middle Ages; it possessed at least four monastic officials, viz., *prieur*, *sacriste*, *chambrier*, and *ouvrier*, each of whom were separately assessed in the tax office; it was dependent upon the Abbey of St. Croix at Bordeaux. Its magnificent Romanic Church is to-day the parish church. At St. Mocaire also there was a convent of Franciscans, founded in 1265, which found a benefactor in Edward III., King of England.

6. The archpresbytery of *Entre-deux-Mers*, north of the preceding one, took its name from its position between the two rivers Garonne and Dordogne. During the Middle Ages the first-mentioned river was, at Bordeaux, constantly called the *sea*. Its archpriest was curé of Génissac; it numbered 54 parishes, 15 simple priories, 2 abbeys, the first of which, a very important one, that of Sauve-Majeure (*Sancto Maria Sylva Maioris*), of the order of St. Benedict, has long since fallen to ruin; but it was generally in a flourishing condition up to the time of the French Revolution. It was founded in 1080 by St. Gérard of Corbie. In 1364 the Black Prince accorded to it a charter of protection. Twelve of its monastic offices were officially registered, viz.: those of *prieur*, *cellérier*, *hotelier*, *chambrier*, *infirmier*, *économe*, *aumônier*, *réfectoier*, *sacriste*, *pitancier*, *bibliothécaire*, and *jardinier* (*ortholanus*). The second abbey was that of Bonlieu or *Risus-Agni*, of the Cistercian order, an affiliation of Pontigny, and founded in 1141 by Blessed Sicaire, a monk of Jouy in Burgundy. Towards 1380 it contained only seven monks, and was partly destroyed by the wars.

7. Across the Garonne, between Libourne and Moulon, was situated the archpresbytery of *Entre-Dordogne*; it was bordered by the river of that name and by the river Isle; its eastern frontier adjoined all along the diocese of Périgueux. The curé of St. Magne was its archpriest, and it numbered 46 parishes, amongst others those of St. Jean in the town of Libourne and St. Symphorien at Castillon, the place where was fought the battle in which Talbot was killed, and which definitely decided the restoration of Guienne to the crown of France. In this district there only existed five priories, but

we also notice there a celebrated Chapter, that of St. Émilion, and one abbey, that of Faize. St. Émilion, much renowned from an archæological point of view, and greatly famed for its generous wine, owes its name to a holy hermit who came from Vannes in the second half of the eighth century, and who died full of days and of merit, celebrated for his miracles, in 767. An abbey was erected over his grave; but it was secularised on the 18th December, 1309, by Clement V. The collegiate church possessed 12 canons, 1 dean, 3 other dignitaries, a cantor, sacristan, and an almoner. Besides the abbey there were, in the town of St. Emilion, a convent of Franciscans and one of Dominicans, and lastly an endowed hospital which owed its existence to the liberality of a certain canon, Eyméric de Vinhey, who made a will in its favour in 1403. Libourne possessed a Franciscan house and two hospitals. Faize was a Cistercian abbey affiliated to Pontigny, and established in 1137 by the generosity of Pierre, Viscount of Castillon. From the thirteenth century there was a house of Great Carmelites at Castillon.

8. To the north and west of "Entre-Dordogne," from which it was separated by the river Isle, we find the archpresbytery of *Fronsac*. Its principal town was Bonzac. It numbered 35 parishes, 19 priories, and 1 abbey, St. Pierre de Guîtres, of the order of Cluny, the origin of which is unknown. Its fine church still exists unimpaired. Our tithe-roll enables us to know the number of the monastic offices. They were: *aumônier*, *pitancier*, *sacriste*, and *ouvrier*.

9. West of the archpresbytery of Fronsac, and also upon the right bank of the Dordogne, was the archpresbytery of *Bourg*, with its principal town of Gauriac. It comprised 40 parishes and 8 priories. The town of Bourg, which was rather celebrated in the Middle Ages, possessed an abbey belonging to the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. Its history is very obscure. As regards its monastic offices our texts for 1350–1450 only mention, besides the abbot, the sacristan and the almoner. Finally we may mention the priories of the Hospitallers of St. Antoine d'Artiguelongue and of St. Lazare de Bourg.

10. The last archpresbytery of the diocese was that of Blaye, upon the right bank of the Gironde, whose archpriest

was curé of Marcillac. It numbered 26 parishes; 16 priories; three abbeys, of which Pleine selve of the Premonstratensian order, established in the middle of the twelfth century, was rarely in a very flourishing condition. Saint Romain of Blaye, belonging to the Canons Regular of Saint Augustine, was a very ancient monastery owing its name to a holy priest, a contemporary of Saint Martin, mentioned by Gregory of Tours in his *de gloria confessorum*. The monastic offices in this monastery in the beginning of the eleventh century were those of *chambrier* and *sacristain*. Bertrand du Chastel caused much anxiety to the Bordelais by his suspected intrigues with the Duc d'Orleans and other French captains. The third abbey in Blaye was that of Saint Sauveur de Blaye, of the order of Saint Benedict; the authors of *Gallia Christiana* have ignored its origin; it had three monastic officers: *sacriste*, *hotelier*, and *ouvrier*. From the year 1218, Blaye possessed in addition one hospital.

It is now time to speak of the revenues and of the various benefices both secular and regular. A title-roll of 1362, unfortunately very incomplete, provides us with very accurate references upon this subject, but the interpretation of the figures is difficult, owing to the incessant variations in the money of this region and doubtless of various other places in the fourteenth century. A very competent numismatist, M. Emile Lalanne, Director of the public weights in Bordeaux, assures me that in the text with which we are dealing, it is the *livre* of Bordeaux which is meant; and he thinks, though not without some hesitation upon this almost insoluble problem, that we might use a multiple of fifteen to get at the real value. I give in the footnote* some prices in Bordeaux *livres* of 1337, the preceding accounts being in leopards and pounds sterling.

For 267 parishes mentioned two curés received 80 liv.; one curé 77 liv.; three had 70 liv.; one 65 liv.; four 60 liv.; twenty-three

* *Clothing*: 1½ ell of blanket, 42 sous; thread and making, 20 sous; 2 ells of grey and 2 ells of red cloth for a gown, intended for the nephew of the archbishop, 10 liv.; to the tailor for the making of one double gown, for two pairs of stockings and for two double cowls for the same, 30 sous; four dozen gloves, 56 sous; nine pairs of shoes for the *cubicularius* of the archbishop, 31 sous; three pairs of stockings for the same, 45 sous; 18 pairs of shoes for two little choristers, 75 sous; repairing the shoes of a valet, 2 sous 11 deniers. Wages: Six days of gardeners, 17 sous 6 deniers; six days of women who have weeded the garden, 6 sous.

from 40 to 55 liv.; eleven from 32 to 35 liv.; thirty-two had 30 liv.; twenty-five 25 liv.; and forty 20 liv. The following are the lowest figures: thirteen curés received 10 liv.; one 9 liv.; and two 5 liv.

Here we have the revenues of the abbeys: Guîtres Bourg and Saint Romain of Blaye, 500 liv.; Saint Sauveur of Blaye, 300 liv.; Isle, 150 liv.; la Sauve, 140 liv.; Pleineselve and Verteuil, 100 liv.; Bonlieu, 30 liv.; the abbot and monks of Faize, 100 liv.

The figures relating to the monastic offices of the various abbeys vary very considerably, the maximum being 500 liv. to the cellarer of the Sauve, and the minimum 6 liv. to the *hotelier* of Saint-Sauveur of Blaye.

With regard to the priors the extreme figures also vary very much. To determine them precisely it would be necessary to entirely transcribe the entries in the before-mentioned roll.

The Metropolitan City.

Such is a brief, but still I believe complete, list of the ecclesiastical establishments existing in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in the ten archpresbyteries of the diocese of Bordeaux. It remains for me to enumerate those of the metropolis itself, where they multiplied very quickly as time rolled on. Like all cities of any considerable importance in the Middle Ages, the capital of Guyenne was bristling with the towers of parish and conventual churches, chapels and houses of Hospitallers which in certain quarters crowded closely upon each other; while in others they were less numerous, but everywhere the service of God was amply provided for and almost the entire population, profoundly Catholic, could find, everywhere at hand, abundant means of satisfying their devotion.

We are well acquainted, thanks especially to M. Leo Drouyn, with the Bordeaux of 1450 during the last days of the English dominion there. He has drawn up a plan of it upon a very large scale, all the indications of which are verified by original and contemporary texts. In those days the town was not of quite the same form as it is to-day; now it is in the shape of an elongated crescent, of which the river forms the

inner curve. At the close of the Middle Ages it was in the form of an irregular octagon, of which eastern sides followed the Garonne. It was very easy at that time to notice its successive growths as the old walls were still in existence.

The Roman Bordeaux, which was a commercial town of great wealth, had never been fortified. Towards the middle of the third century, probably in 276, it was destroyed by the barbarians. About the year 300, the city was re-built and surrounded by very solid ramparts, into which were built, without any order, innumerable *débris* of buildings, stones covered with inscriptions, &c. These ramparts were flanked by 46 towers and were entered by 14 gates. The wall was rectangular, its larger sides measuring a little over 700 mètres, the smaller ones slightly under 500. This is the town which was sung of by Ausonius. The Bordelais were content with it for eight centuries, but during that long period numerous independent structures arose in the *suburbium*. In the North West the faubourg of Saint Seurin gathered itself round the Basilica in which were preserved the relics of the holy and celebrated bishop of that name. In the South were the Abbey of Sainte Croix and the many dwellings which rapidly collected in its shadow. Little by little commercial faubourgs developed themselves, and that so quickly, that by the end of the twelfth century (towards 1200) it was necessary to enclose by a double wall, well provided with towers and fortifications, an entirely new quarter at the south of the city. It was here that the Commune had its hotel-de-ville and that the great merchants built their lofty and strong houses. In 1302, the town had extended itself considerably to the north and south; it was then that the *jurats* decided to construct a third enclosure, the development of which attained to 6000 mètres.

In 1450 the three lines of ramparts were still in existence, well kept and guarded; the town was strong, free, rich and well populated. It had been for some time a capital which had to be respected by the central power. During the whole time of the union of the Bordelais country with the English crown, the Church had strengthened herself there, and had grown in power and riches, had increased her privileges and exercised in civil, juridical and political affairs a prominent part which increased as time went on. The archbishop's

palace, two chapters, 15 parishes, 13 chapels, 14 priories and hospitals, 1 abbey, 5 convents of men and 3 of women, such is the strong staff of ecclesiastical and religious establishments which had sprung up and taken root in the soil of Bordeaux.

At the south-west angle of the Roman *castrum* rose the Cathedral, dedicated to Saint Andrew; this was certainly no longer the church which was consecrated by Pope Urban II. in 1096. Some parts of it had been rebuilt, notably in the first years of the fourteenth century. The transept and the choir with their collateral naves, their chapels, their four towers and their superb portals, are particularly remarkable from the double point of view of their architectural conception and their sculptural decoration, while their dimensions are very considerable. In the large nave, which is simple but of immense size, used to be held the municipal assemblies to which the "common people" were called. It is here that upon the 25th July every year the new *jurats* were proclaimed; here that they exchanged oaths with the *bourgeois*, as also did the King of England's representatives. At the time of which we are speaking the rich and powerful Metropolitan Chapter had just finished erecting, towards the apse of the church, the beautiful square belfry, which stands quite isolated and is known by the name of "Pey Berland Tower."

The large nave was surrounded on all sides—on one side by the canons' houses, which were built round a charming cloister in the fourteenth century, and which were very unadvisedly destroyed a few years ago; on the other by the archbishop's palace, an immense pile of buildings of all periods, in which very illustrious personages were often received, especially princes and lords from England. It was here that King John was brought after the fatal battle of Poitiers. The Dean of the Chapter had a charming house close by.

At the bottom of the square, behind the apse of Saint André, stood the Romanic chapel of Saint Sauveur, and just behind it the little parish church of Notre Dame de la Place. This church was, for a long time, the centre of a confraternity of thirteen priests, called "La Treisaine," which was instituted in 1237 by Archbishop Géraud de Malemort and confirmed by Pey Berland in 1440. When, at the beginning of the

fourteenth century, Notre Dame de la Place was given up to the Irish Seminary, the exercises of the "Treisaine" were carried out at Saint André. There were eight other parishes within the limits of the Roman *castrum*, viz.: Saint Paul, Saint Christoly, Notre Dame de Puy-Paulin, Saint Projet, St. Mexans, Saint Siméon, Saint Remi, and finally Saint Pierre, of which the nave alone stood inside the ancient walls; the *jurats* had just rebuilt the choir outside of them. None of these churches were of much value from an artistic point of view. In the old town were still to be seen the chapels of Sainte Marthe and of Sainte Catharine. It was but poorly provided with convents; the Mercy Convent and that of the Order of the Temple had been built there. I am not aware of the exact epoch at which the Templars came to Bordeaux, but the Frères de la Merci established themselves there in 1320. There had also been in the same quarter some Friars of the Sack, *Sachets* or *fratres de sacco*, whose convent seems to have enjoyed but a short existence.

It was also in the ancient Gallo-Roman town, not far from the Cathedral, that was to be found Saint André, the most important hospital of Bordeaux. It had been instituted in 1390 by the liberality of a rich canon, Vital Carles, a cantor of the Church of Bordeaux. As he had evidently noticed that a good number of the charitable institutions which had been erected as benefices had, in time, become ordinary secular priories, he expressly desired that his should be governed by a lay Hospitaller, and placed it under the patronage of the mayors and *jurats* of the town; but of course it was an understood thing that the hospital should have its chaplains, for it was really more the care of the souls of the poor and sick than the alleviation of their bodily sufferings which determined him to bestow his bounty.

At the time of the first enlargement of the town there were two parish churches, Saint Eloi, and Sainte Colombe. The first was the chapel of the *jurats*, whose tribunal was called the "Court of Saint Eliège"; its front faced the Hôtel de Ville and the two walls of the second inclosure hemmed it in very narrowly. Though it has since been provided with a side-aisle it still retains the type of a very small city Church of the Middle Ages. Its apse, of the fourteenth and fifteenth

centuries, is very elegant and in very good style. Sainte Colombe covered the spot which bears its name until the year 1607, when it collapsed on the 2nd December. I have found amongst the diocesan archives a petition from the churchwardens from which I judge that the façade of this ancient church must have possessed great artistic interest. The area of Sainte Colombe was singularly restricted, its greatest length not reaching more than 250 mètres and its greatest width 150 mètres at most. In the same quarter I find three chapels; those of Lopsault, Notre Dame des Ayres and Saint Jean; a commandery of Saint Antoine, founded in 1352, whose buildings, later on, passed into the hands of the *Fevillants*, and three hospitals, Notre Dame de Cayffernau, Sent Marsaau and Sent Johan. We do not know anything more of these chapels and hospitals than their existence, which is proved, especially by the contemporary mention of them found in the terriers and in the registers of dues. We know, however, that Saint Jean belonged to the order of Hospitallers, and that in 1224 the Brothers acknowledged a debt of 36 sols annual tax to the Metropolitan Chapter.

The third enlargement of the town of Bordeaux has, very justly, been called "the quarter of the convents"; it is there that the imposing mass of buildings of the abbey of Sainte Croix has risen since the Middle Ages; and there that the monasteries of the Mendicant Friars were built in the thirteenth century.

The northern portion of this third enlargement was dependent upon the parish churches of Saint Remy and Saint Mexans, of whose existence we have already spoken as being in the Roman city. In the south three other parishes had been erected *ab antiquo*: Sainte Eulalie, which most likely replaced the ancient monastery of Vierges spoken of in the *Gallia Christiana* according to the *Acta sanctorum ordinis sancti Benedicti*; Saint Michel, and finally Sainte Croix, where one of the collateral naves of the abbey was appropriated for parish use and assigned to a secular curate.

Sainte Eulalie, whose district extended far beyond the ramparts, still exists with its naves, its elegant spire, rebuilt about thirty years ago, and its charming polygonal apse of the fifteenth century. This church gloried in the possession of

remarkable relics, notably those of SS. Clarus, Justinus and their companions, martyrs, piously preserved by Charlemagne. Lopès, basing his account on authentic documents, tells us that in 1174, the Archbishop, Guillaume le Templier,

consecrated the parish church, Sainte Eulalie, of Bordeaux and afterwards united the curacy to the Chapter of the Metropolitan Church, which had enjoyed for a long time (as we are told by the deeds) the right of burial and of the sacraments in this church, and Pope Alexander III. authorised this union.

At first Saint Michel was only a simple chapel, dependent upon the abbey of Sainte Croix. Its possession was the subject of serious litigations in the eleventh century between the monks and the canons of the Metropolitan Church. The monks, having proved the antiquity of their rights, obtained, in 1099, permission to remain there in a decree of Archbishop Amatus, Papal Legate, on condition of their paying an annual rent of two sols to the chapter. Many of the Popes successively confirmed this decision, especially Clement V., who never forgot the assistance which he had received from the abbot and monks in the troublous days of his episcopate. Like the other parishes of Bordeaux, Saint Michel never possessed a curé who bore the title; it was governed by a perpetual curate, but during the whole of the Middle Ages it never ceased to increase in population and in wealth. Its endowments were very numerous, and the services attached to them were performed by a college of incumbents, whom Louis XI., in the year 1466, vainly endeavoured to form into a chapter. The parochial spirit was very highly developed in this quarter, and the inhabitants had constantly in view the object of giving to their church an architectural and decorative splendour which should make it rank as one of the first in the city. In this they succeeded. Saint Michel, which was almost entirely completed in 1450, is a very beautiful edifice, not without defects, it is true, but of very great artistic value. The vast proportions of its conception are far superior to the collegiate church of Saint Seurin and to the abbey church of Sainte Croix. The magnificent belfrey, one of the most beautiful ornaments of the town, was built only in February 1474. At the time of which I am speaking, the spot upon which it now stands was occupied by a simple chapel, built over a charnel-house in the centre

of the parish cemetery. The abbey and parish church of Sainte Croix is also still in existence. It had a splendid Romanic façade, which had been left unfinished by the monks and which has been restored, or rather rebuilt, in our own times; though not without having, according to the best critics, lost something of its original character. The interior is large and sufficiently regular, the three naves being terminated by beautiful apses of the twelfth century. It is quite beyond doubt that this Benedictine abbey dates from the time of the Merovingians; the story *de monacho burdigalensi*, told by Gregory of Tours, quite gives us the idea of a community of monks organised and governed by an abbot. This monastery stood outside the walls of the town until the beginning of the fourteenth century. It must have been destroyed by the Saracens in 732; restored at first by Charlemagne; then restored again by the Normans; and finally definitely re-established by the Duke of Gascony, Guillaume le Bon. Since that time its prosperity has always been on the increase. It was richly endowed with *praedia* and with dues, many churches were given over to it, and princes and popes conferred great privileges upon it. The list of abbots given us by the *Gallia* is a very full one, the first mentioned being that of Elias towards the year 902. The 20th, Pierre Arnaud, was created cardinal by Clement V. at the time of his first promotion. In 1375 the abbey was governed by Pierre de Fermat, 22nd abbot, distinguished on the list as *optimus abbas*. After him we find, 24th, Pierre de Camiade (1349-1371); 25th, Raymond Bouard de Roqueis (1376-1380), who later on became Archbishop of Bordeaux; 26th, Bernard Salomon (1382-1384); 27th, Amanieu de la Mothe (1384-1412); 28th, Pierre Andrieu (1412-1435), who for a long time was collector for the Apostolic Chamber, and obtained the freedom of the abbey from Martin V.; 29th, the Englishman, Pascal Guilbort, who was elected upon the recommendation of Henry VI.; (1436-1489), but who was obliged to resign the crozier to the Bishop of Bazas; 30th, Henri de Cavier, the first commendatory abbot (1439-1446); and 31st, Pierre de Bramo, Protonotary Apostolic, also held the monastery in commendam. The abbot's revenue was estimated in 1362 at 316 Bordeaux livres.

The various cloister offices were, at the end of the Middle

Ages, and had been no doubt for long before, established as distinct benefices. When the tithes were collected in 1362 we find mentioned the *célérrier*, the *chambrier*, the *poissonier*, the *chanfre*, the *sacriste*, the *refectorier*, the *infirmier*, the *hôtelier*, and the *ouvrier*. Each one of them possessed, within the enclosure of the abbey grounds, his house, garden, and other dependencies. Their united revenue amounted to 1526 Bordeaux livres. In the records of the *jurats* (October 15, 1406) is preserved a document which informs us very accurately of the staff of Sainte Croix at that time: *L'abat de Senta-Crotz trameto bert messenhors* (the *jurats*) *per cedula, los noms deus senhors, monges, caperans et clerics deudeit monester n'y d'on erant*; the *prieur claustral*, the *sous-prieur*, the *chambrier*, the *refectorier*, the *sacriste*, the *chanfre*, the *infirmier*, the *hôtelier*, the *sous-chanfre*, the *pitancier*; six chaplains, one of whom was styled *vicaire* (no doubt the perpetual curate of the parish), and four prebendaries; finally twelve clerks, two of whom were attached to the person of the prior, one to the vice-prior, one to the chamberlain, one to the refectorian, five to the sacristan, one to the infirmarian, and one to the guest-master.

The abbey was surrounded by a sanctuary, whose inhabitants were free from the jurisdiction of the magistrates of the town and of the heads of the trade guilds. In fact its territory was as large as that of the parish, which extended as far as the outskirts of the town. Near the apse of the church stood a chapel dedicated to St. Mary Magdalen.

In 1418 there arose serious disagreements between the abbot and monks of Sainte Croix and the archbishop, David de Montferrand. The monks obtained a Bull which entirely exempted them from the jurisdiction of the archbishop. The prelate naturally did not look at all favourably upon this restriction put upon his authority, and tried his very utmost to prevent, as long as he could, the execution of the apostolic concession. In 1423 a new Bull was issued commanding the Bishop of Aire, the Dean of Saint Seurin, and Abbot of Saint Sever to suppress this resistance. Threatened with excommunication, the archbishop was at last obliged to submit, and, says Dom Devienne, "it is not known that the religious of Sainte Croix after this had ever anything to trouble or impede them in the enjoyment of the privilege accorded to them by

Martin V." I do not think, however, that this favour at all contributed to the regularity or to the spiritual prosperity of the abbey. In any case it was in a most deplorable state in the sixteenth century and at the commencement of the seventeenth, and things went from bad to worse until the time when Cardinal Sourdis brought about the union of Sainte Croix with the congregation of Saint Maur (1627).

In the same quarter of the town the Mendicant orders possessed a number of convents of great importance. The one nearest to Sainte Croix was that of the Franciscans, who in Bordeaux were styled the "Menuts" (*minores*). They came to the town in 1228.

The Cartulary of Sainte Croix has preserved for us an account of the agreement between their provincial on the one hand and the abbot and monks of Sainte Croix on the other. They were not permitted to receive any offering for the celebration of Mass excepting the incense and the candles; they were not to receive to penance or burial any parishioners either of Sainte Croix or of Sainte Michel without permission from the chaplain, and might not acquire any goods from these two churches. In the same cartulary there is inserted a charter of Archbishop Gérard de Malemort (May 23, 1228), declaring that he had consecrated the cemetery of the Friars Minor at Maucailhou, in the parish of Saint Michel, upon the following conditions: That they should only allow to be buried there the brothers of the Order who, while still in good health, had taken the religious habit; and that they should receive in their monastery those monks of Sainte Croix who should go there for the purpose of celebrating the Divine Offices; in the event of these regulations being transgressed the cemetery should be closed. In 1247, owing to the liberality of a rich bourgeois, Pierre de Bordeaux, they were able finally to build their church. The monastery was of considerable size, but I have not been able to obtain any information as to the number of friars which it generally contained. They received regularly, like all the other Mendicant orders, the alms of the *jurats* and of the archbishop. In 1420 the *jurats* issued to the guardian and priors of the Augustinians, of the Dominicans, and of the Carmelites an order to expel, within two days, all the religious of French extraction.

Quite close to the "Menuts" lived the "Menudes," viz., the Franciscan nuns or Poor Clares.

I have not been able to discover so far [says Baurein] the year in which they established themselves at Bordeaux. The oldest voucher which has come under my notice, and which mentions these nuns, is the will of Pierre Carpin, prebendary of Saint Seurin in the year 1295. This ecclesiastic bequeaths to them, as also to other communities in the town, a legacy of 20 sols.

Les Sors Menudas were at first established outside of the walls, which place they were obliged to leave at a date not precisely known, their buildings having been destroyed to help in the defence of the town. This site was preserved, and in 1375 was called "Menudas Belhas" (*apud Minorissas antiquas*). Baurein found, in an act of Jan. 18, 1375, the names of twelve religious composing part of the community, and many of them belonged to noble families. An abbess governed this convent, to which frequent legacies were bequeathed, and which existed until the last quarter of the sixteenth century. At that time its revenues were incorporated with the Convent of the *Anonciades* which had been but lately founded at Bordeaux.

The Augustinians claimed as their founder Robert Burnell, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Chancellor to the King of England. Lopès has published the Act of December 21, 1257, in which is verified the permission accorded to these religious to build a church and to have a cemetery upon the ground belonging to the parishes of Saint Eloi and Sainte Eulalie, on condition that they should pay a rental of 30 livres, and under the ordinary restrictions concerning the administration of the Sacraments and the burial of the dead. A sentence of the official, dated April 20, 1336, ratifies their obligations with regard to the canons of the Metropolitan Church. Their church was a very large one. The bell tower, much disfigured, however, is still in existence.

Adjoining this religious house was that of the Augustinian nuns. M. Leo Drouyn has discovered in an ancient inventory of Saint André (Act of July 12, 1354), the proof that they held from the Chapter

the ground upon which they lived, in return for the pension of certain

corporals, and of a *tourillon* of good linen, according to the quality and estate of the Chapter of Bordeaux, and this each year upon the feast of Saint Andrew.

This convent was no longer in existence at the end of the sixteenth century.

The house of the Carmelites also stood in the southern portion of the third extension of Bordeaux. The following is what Lopès says of it :

On the 26th June, in the year 1264, the Chapter came to an agreement with the Carmelite Fathers concerning the monastery which they had built in their district. It was not, however, in this year, that they were first established, as M. de Saint Marthe writes in his *chronique*, after de Lurbe, but long before; first on the spot which is still called *lous Carmes Bielhs*, which is at present incorporated in the Convent of the nuns of the *Anonciades*, and secondly where they are still at the present day, in the year 1217 by Gaillard, Lord of Landes, at which place died Simon Stock, the sixth general of their order, who was buried there in 1250.

The authors of *Gallia* seem to believe, upon good grounds, I think, that the first establishment of Carmelites at Bordeaux did not take place before the middle of the thirteenth century.

The Dominicans had built their monastery in the north of the town, and this seems to have been the most important one in the city of Bordeaux. Bernard Gui relates, with his accustomed precision, the circumstances of its foundation. It took place in 1230 during the episcopate of Géraud de Malemort, and was due to the liberality of a rich bourgeois of Bordeaux, Amanieu Colomb. From the outset the Dominicans of Bordeaux obtained many privileges from Gregory IX. When the Archbishop hesitated as to whether he should bless their cemetery, the Pope commanded him to do so, substituting, in the event of his refusal, the Bishop of Comminges.

Later on [says Rabanis] Simon de Montfort added to the monastery buildings a splendid infirmary, and such was the magnificence of the whole that it became the habitual place of residence of the Kings of England when they visited the city; the part of the monastery which was occupied by them being called the Royal Apartments.

In the deeds of the last presentation made to the Dominicans by the Kings of England, Henry VI. gives as the motive of his gifts that

this Convent possessed vaster and more remarkable buildings than any other house of the same order, and that a large portion of these had been built with the design of accommodating not only the kings, but also the princes and their families and other high dignitaries of the State so long as they should remain in Bordeaux.

In 1325 Arnaud Calhau, a former Mayor of Bordeaux, Seneschal of Saintonge and Lord of Blaye, rebuilt the Chapter Room, the richness of which was in keeping with the rest of the house. The church measured about 60 mètres in length, and 45 at its greatest breadth.

The Dominican nuns or *Sors de Santa Catharina*, certainly possessed a convent at Bordeaux about the year 1450; but I do not know the date at which they were founded, and what may have been their importance.

Five hospitals were successively established in that part of the town which was surrounded by ramparts in the fourteenth century; that of Saint Esprit, not far from the Dominican Convent (and which, later, became a priory united to the College of Saint Raphaël towards the end of the sixteenth century); that of Puch-Moton, near the Church of Saint Michel, about which M. Leo Drouyn has collected considerable evidence; Sainte Croix, which, however, was perhaps founded only after the year 1450; the hospital of the *Peste*, whose name sufficiently indicates the object for which it was especially destined; and, finally, the most important of all, that of Saint James, whose church had been restored to use during this century, and which was transformed into a warehouse by the decrees of 1880.

In 1119, says the *Chronique de Bordeaux*, William, Duke of Guienne, in honour and in memory of Saint James, founded at Bordeaux the hospital and priory of St. James, in which pilgrims going to and returning from Saint Jaques in Galicia, should be housed, lodged, and fed, and foundlings, deserted by father and mother, should be kept and nourished until they attained the use of reason.*

The Archbishop Armand Géraud, in the year 1122, conferred upon the Chapter (of Saint André) the power of confirming the prior who

* "Guillaume, duc de Guienne, en l'honneur et memoire de Saint Jaques, institue à Bordeaux l'hospital et prieuré de Saint Jammes, auquel les pèlerins allans et venans de Saint Jaques en Galice seroient héberger et nourriz et les enfans exposez n'estant advouez de père et de mère, nourriz jusques à l'âge de connoissance."—*Chronique Bourdelaise*. An. 1119.

should be presented to them and the payment of dues which the hospital had to make to him every year upon the feast of St. James the Apostle; so long as no one dying in the parishes dependent upon the Chapter should be buried in the cemetery which he had consecrated for the hospital, with the sole object of the burial of the poor, without license or permission from the canons. And as fresh disagreements arose between the brothers of this hospital and the canons, Géraud, Archbishop of Auch, Papal Legate, following the advice given him by Guillaume, Archbishop of Bordeaux; Elias, Bishop of Agen; Aimar of Saintes; Garsies of Bazas and Guillaume of Acqs, delivered sentence in the year 1174, in which permission was granted to the hospital to bury the brothers who served there, as also the poor and pilgrims; ordaining that with regard to others who should be buried there, whether from the city or from the outskirts, half of all the offerings which were made upon the day of the funeral, and upon the seventh and thirtieth days of the ensuing month, as well as half of all the goods, whether household or otherwise, which should be left in legacy, should belong, without any diminution, to the canons. It was also added that every year one of the brothers of this hospital should present himself before the Chapter and ask them to depute a canon to celebrate High Mass in their church on the feast of St. James, upon which occasion he should be paid the annual tax of two sols, and this decree was confirmed by a papal bull of Pope Alexander III. on the 30th June (Lopès).

This priory was taken on lease by the Jesuits in 1574, for the instruction of youth both in good morals and in the teaching of Catholic religion, with the charge of the housing and nourishing of foundlings and pilgrims before mentioned.—*Chronique Bourdelaise.*

Again, in the suburbs of the town we find numerous charitable institutions and chapels: the Hospital of Saint Julien, founded in 1231 for poor pilgrims; that of the Gahets, with its Church of Saint Nicholas, "destined at first," according to Baurein, "for men supposed to be suffering from *ladrerie* or leprosy." These poor people were sometimes the objects of special acts of charity; many wills of the fourteenth century, examined by the same writer, mention legacies made to the "community of the Gahets of Bordeaux;" and the chapels St. Genès, St. Laurent d'Escures, and St. Germain.

In 1383 the Carthusians of Vauclaire, being obliged to leave their monastery, which had been wrecked by the French soldiery, took refuge in Bordeaux, where they were received by a rich notary, Pierre de Maderan. They were given some buildings and a garden in the north of the town, where they established themselves and continued to keep this *hospitium*, where some of the monks still resided even after more favour-

able circumstances permitted the others to return to Périgord. This is proved by conclusive documents which were preserved by Baurein.

I have kept for the last the important faubourg of St. Seurin, which was, probably, the first centre of Christianity in Bordeaux. In the neighbourhood of the basilica, in which were venerated the relics of the great bishop of the fifth century—a church already celebrated for its crypt and its Merovingian tombs, surrounded by its cloister, its houses of canons, the *oustaus* of its dignitaries—there were no less than six chapels and two hospitals. A short distance from the Port Dijeaux stood the chapel of St. Ladre, relating to which Baurein has collected a number of deeds, and which certainly existed before 1235 and after 1331; the chapel of “La Recluse;” a little distance from it and opposite the gate of St. Symphorien, stood a chapel of the same name; then came that of the priory of St. Martin of Mont Judaïque, which without doubt replaced an extremely ancient oratory dedicated to the great Bishop of Tours. Close to this church the holy Archbishop Pey Berland (1430–1451) founded a hospital under the patronage of St. Peter :

He provided it with beds, an income, and all things necessary for the maintenance of the buildings, and of the eleven poor persons whom they were obliged to receive, whatever part they came from; he made a foundation for a priest to reside there and to direct it, and who should be, at the same time, Titulary of the Chapel of Andernos; he also placed there an hospitaller of honest life and good reputation, or a woman of the same character, to wait upon the poor. In one of the codicils of his will, he bequeathed to this foundation a hundred gold nobles which he had lent to Medard de Durfort and to other cavaliers, also a missal, a chalice, a chasuble, and a coffer or box in which to preserve these vestments.

In the cemetery which surrounded the collegiate Church on three sides, there stood, in the Middle Ages, three chapels. That of St. Étienne was, according to all appearance, one of the primitive sanctuaries in which the first Christians of Bordeaux used to congregate; it was originally the parish church of the faubourg; that of St. Georges, “which was already old at the end of the thirteenth century,” was used later on as a charnel-house; and, finally, that of St. Esprit, built in a hexagon, which had, most likely, succeeded an

ancient baptistry, became the seat of a celebrated confraternity.

Such were, as far as we may with certainty gather, the benefices of the diocese and of the town of Bordeaux, at the close of the Middle Ages. Even putting apart from our Church the Metropolitan rank, which she so justly merits, we may truly say of her that by the extent of her territory and the large number of her establishments both charitable and religious, she ranked as one of the first in France, and indeed in all Christendom. To give a more complete and exact idea of her greatness it is necessary to speak with more detail of her two great chapters of St. Seurin and St. André and of her archbishops, and this will form the subject of a subsequent article.

ERNEST ALLAIN.

ART. VIII.—SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF THE DELUGE.

The Secret of Plato's Atlantis. By Lord ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR.
London : Burns & Oates. 1885.

On Certain Phenomena belonging to the Close of the Last Geological Period, and on their bearing upon the Tradition of the Flood. By JOSEPH PRESTWICH, D.C.L., F.R.S., F.G.S. London : Macmillan & Co. 1895.

SOME few years ago a work was published entitled "*Atlantis : the Antediluvian World*," by Ignatius Donnelly. It seems to have reached its seventh edition in the year 1883; but we do not think that we ourselves or our readers would ever have heard of it, if it had not elicited a reply from Lord Arundell of Wardour. It is founded upon a mythical tale, related by Plato, from whose works, translated by the late Professor Jowett, Lord Arundell, in an Appendix to his treatise quotes it at full length. We need not dwell upon it in any detail, but may briefly explain that *Atlantis* was imagined to be an island in the Atlantic Ocean near the Pillars of Hercules, which fell to the lot of the god Poseidon, who, falling in love with a young lady whom he met there, took up his abode in the island and founded a kingdom; it was a beautiful and fertile place, full of fruits, flowers, and abundant vegetation, as well as of various kinds of animals. Mr. Donnelly, contrary to general opinion and particularly to that of Professor Jowett (no mean authority on a matter of that kind) who regarded it merely as a fable, believed the story to be based on fact. He maintained that there once really existed in the Atlantic Ocean, opposite the mouth of the Mediterranean, a large island, the remnant of an Atlantic Continent; that it had been inhabited by a "populous and mighty nation," some of whom migrated to the eastern coasts of America and also to Europe. That it was the true antediluvian world, the Garden of the Hesperides, the Garden of Eden, the Elysian Fields, &c. &c.; that early mankind dwelled there in peace and happiness, but

that it perished in a terrible convulsion of nature, when the whole island with nearly all its inhabitants sank into the ocean, a few escaping in ships and rafts and carrying with them the tidings of the catastrophe, which we find still surviving in the legends of the Deluge.

Now the Atlantic Ocean has been very fully and carefully sounded ; indeed we might venture to say that the bottom of that vast sea is almost as well known as its surface, and we should have thought that if an island in such a position had been submerged, it could scarcely by any possibility have escaped notice when soundings were made in that part of the ocean. Be that as it may, however, Lord Arundell takes the ground of history and tradition in his reply to Mr. Donnelly ; and he shows that Plato's story was probably a fable originating in the narrative of a voyage to the north-west coast of Africa, by the Carthaginian Hanno about 505 B.C. He also adduces evidence to prove the general diffusion of the tradition of the Flood ; its existence (as is well known) among the Greeks, and in some uncivilised nations, including the aboriginal races of North America, where one would not readily expect to find it.* Lord Arundell in a former work on "Tradition," has gone into these subjects at greater length ; but we do not propose to dwell upon this at present, for the existence of the great diluvian tradition is now generally recognised. It supplies indeed the ground for the recent work of Professor Prestwich, to which we are now about to call the attention of our readers. Before proceeding further, we may say that whatever weight we may attach to the traditional recollections of the Flood amongst half-civilised or barbarous nations, there are three accounts of it especially noteworthy : one is the Scriptural narrative ; another familiar to classical scholars, the story of Deucalion ; the third, a very old version, recently brought to light by the investigators of Oriental tablets, the Babylonian or Chaldæan narrative. It is to be remarked that in all three we have the same feature of the escape of one

* In a recent work entitled "The Land of the Maskeg," by H. Somers Somerset, a tradition of the tribe called the Cree Indians, showing a belief in the Deluge, is mentioned. This tribe inhabits the extreme North of America, and, like other tribes in those parts, have in great measure been converted by Catholic missionaries.

family in an Ark or vessel; in the Book of Genesis it is Noah and his wife, his sons and their wives; in the classical story, Deucalion and Pyrrha; in the Chaldæan, Sisuthros, his household, his slaves, and his concubines. In all three a warning from some deity or demi-god is given: in all a great rain causes or assists in causing the flood: in all a sacrifice is offered after the Deluge has subsided. In the Chaldæan account, the dove and raven, also a swallow, are sent out from the Ark, and allusion is made to the rainbow: the duration of the Flood, however, is much shorter, and it is not stated that the tops of the high hills were all covered. On the whole, however, this last-mentioned version has a great resemblance to the Biblical narrative, both of them doubtless originating in the same ancient story, at first verbally handed down from father to son, and subsequently put in writing; though the Chaldæan form of it has been corrupted by passing through heathen hands, and the polytheism of an idolatrous people put in the place of the monotheism of the primitive tradition, which of course has been preserved in Holy Scripture. We are compelled here to differ from Professor Prestwich, who, adopting a theory which we believe we may call an exploded theory, thinks that the process was the reverse of what we have stated, and that it was "the Hebrew narrative" that was "adapted from the Babylonian records, with such alterations as would fit it to a different religious belief." "The Jewish writers," he adds, "have substituted for the polytheism of the Chaldæans the monotheism of their own countrymen."* From this and some other remarks that he makes, it is apparent that Professor Prestwich does not believe in the inspiration of Holy Scripture; but the independent testimony that he bears, while writing from a purely scientific standpoint, to the essential truth of the great tradition is none the less valuable, and indeed some would say all the more valuable, as coming from an unbiassed mind. He has clearly been struck forcibly with the existence of the tradition, and has consequently examined the scientific evidence

* We read not long ago, in some infidel or agnostic writer, that the Early Hebrews were in fact polytheists, and the sacred books were originally cast in a polytheistic form, but were altered at a later period, and made to suit the monotheism then engrafted on the exploded system of idolatry. Such are the speculations, antagonistic and contradictory, of modern unbelievers.

in order to see whether it corresponds with the old belief, or otherwise. The result appears in a small, but most interesting volume, the substance of which we shall endeavour to explain. Before doing so, however, we may observe that there is no one more competent than the author of this work to investigate the evidence afforded by geology and to appreciate its true value. In a critique of a former work of his, published in a scientific paper some months ago, he is spoken of as “the acknowledged *doyen* among British geologists”; and he has occupied the professorial chair at Oxford (though he has now retired) in which formerly sat men such as Buckland and Phillips. The first of these two eminent men (like others of that date) endeavoured to prove or to corroborate the history of the Deluge by certain geological phenomena observed by him, but which have in many instances been explained, and perhaps better explained, in other ways. When that was found to be the case, a reaction occurred, and geology seemed to ignore the Deluge altogether, it being frequently asserted that there was no evidence of its having passed over the surface of the land at the period recorded. The present work is a remarkable reaction in the other direction. It must be borne in mind that Buckland fully believed in Scripture, and defended the whole Biblical narrative, even the universality, *strictly speaking*, of the Deluge—an opinion not now generally held to be a necessary inference from the scriptural record, and one which he himself is said to have afterwards abandoned. “They endeavoured,” Professor Prestwich says, speaking of Buckland and others, “to explain not only the destruction of life, but also such physical impossibilities as the universality of the Deluge, and the story of the Ark and its contents.” Now here again we feel called upon to join issue with our author, and to ask what is there impossible in the story of the Ark? It was surely possible to construct such a vessel, though the fact of its being built beforehand points clearly to Divine guidance, as it never could have been got ready for use suddenly, after the Flood had once commenced. A question may be raised as to the number and variety of the animals preserved in it, but that is not an essential point. The late Professor Huxley, in an article written a few years ago in the *Nineteenth Century*, made a difficulty about the drifting of the Ark helplessly, without

rudder or oar, or other guidance ; but the scriptural history does not state that it was so left to drift, nor does it deny the existence of oars, sail, or rudder, though it does not explicitly allude to them. We have already observed that the Babylonian and Greek versions agree with that in Scripture in attributing the preservation of the human family that escaped to an ark or ship in which they took refuge. It is in fact an important feature in the tradition.

As to the universality of the Deluge, in the full sense of the words, we doubt if even that is a physical impossibility. The great difficulty in accepting it is a biological one ; if no animals were preserved excepting those in the Ark, then we must either suppose a fresh creation, or else evolution on a scale so extensive and so rapid, as neither Darwin nor any of his followers ever imagined.

But we need not dwell on this, for we doubt if any writer in modern times, whose opinion deserves attention, maintains the universality of the Deluge in this sense : and indeed some authors, whose orthodoxy is incontestable, have allowed that we are not necessarily bound to believe that it was strictly speaking universal, even with respect to the whole human race. In the last number of this *REVIEW*, in a short notice of Father Hummelauer's *Commentary on Genesis*, it is stated that this learned Jesuit leaves the question an open one.

Professor Prestwich's hypothesis—and it is to be remembered that he only states it as a very probable hypothesis, open to further investigation—is as follows :—A submergence on a very large scale took place about 10,000 or 12,000 years ago, or perhaps less. The effect of this on the people who witnessed it, and who did not perceive the gradual sinking of the land beneath them, was that of a vast inrush of waters, flooding the plains, and leaving only the tops of very high hills uncovered ; men and animals fled, so far as they possibly could, to the high ground, the greater number being overtaken and drowned, while some escaped and reached the hill-tops, and after the sunken land rose again these fugitives returned and re-peopled the earth, that is, the large portion of it that had been flooded : the whole process took but a comparatively short time, the emergence being more rapid in some places than in others : an alteration in the level of the land was the result in

some places of the catastrophe, and very possibly a change of climate took place.

It will perhaps be in the recollection of our readers that Sir Henry Howorth published a few years ago a work called the "Mammoth and the Flood," in which he went partly over the same ground that our present author does; it attracted a good deal of attention at the time and was noticed by the magazines and literary papers, amongst others in the pages of the *Edinburgh Review* in an article proceeding, as we were led to believe, from the pen of an accomplished Catholic lady. It is remarkable that Professor Prestwich does not allude to this work, so that we must consider his present treatise as an entirely independent judgment on the phenomena he has observed, and which have led him to the same conclusion as Sir Henry Howorth, viz., that the remains of animals, and particularly the mammoth, point to their having been suddenly destroyed by a vast deluge. As, however, the Professor does not touch on the work of Sir Henry Howorth, we shall so far follow him and confine our remarks to the treatise at present before us.

Professor Prestwich does not, we may add, lay any particular stress on the remains of the Mammoth, but mentions it among other animals. We now proceed to lay before our readers the substance of his argument, the principle of which is the one so well known in scientific investigation—that certain geological phenomena, which cannot otherwise be satisfactorily explained, are exactly what we should expect to find, supposing this theory to be true.

A preliminary objection, however, has to be met: there arose some years ago a geological school, of whose opinions the late Sir Charles Lyell was perhaps the leading exponent, and whose doctrine was that no great catastrophes had ever taken place; and that the facts which the geological record unfolds to us were all explicable by the operation of agencies precisely similar to those that we now see working—thus involving (as Professor Prestwich expresses it) "the assumption of uniformity in degree in all time." This doctrine is not generally maintained by the more recent school of modern geology; and the author of the work before us discards it, and states that up to the very date of the submergence "described in the follow-

ing pages, the crust of the earth was in a very mobile state"—a fact "proved by the presence of raised beaches with shells of existing species at elevations of 10 feet, 100, and up to 600 feet or more."

The circumstance "that the species of shells are recent throughout" is particularly to be noted, as proving the comparatively modern date of these upheavals.

Leaving for the present the question how many men and how many animals escaped—on the assumption that this great submergence took place—a great number of creatures of various kinds in their flight before the advancing Flood would certainly have been overtaken and drowned.

Now large fissures have been found in different, and indeed widely different, places, and in some cases on isolated hills of considerable height: in these fissures there have been discovered a great quantity of animal remains, not entire skeletons, but broken bones, singularly fresh, few of them being in their relative position, and none of them gnawed by carnivora. In England fissures of this character are common in the limestone rocks near Plymouth; they exist in the Cretaceous and Jurassic limestones in the South of France, and in certain high hills in Central France; also in parts of Italy, and in Sicily, where in the cave of San Ciro, near Palermo, an enormous quantity of hippopotamus bones have been discovered—and at the Rock of Gibraltar, in the limestone ranges of the North African Coast and elsewhere.

If then as the land emerged after the catastrophe, "the effluent waters swept into the open fissures the *débris* of the old land surface, together with the remains of the drowned animals, with more or less force and violence"—the result would be precisely as we find it.

When the surface-rubble was not "caught as it were *in transitu*," it would be swept down to lower levels, so as to form banks of breccia on the slopes and at the base of the hills. It sometimes, however, happened that at the sea-coast, owing to the land having stood at a lower level before the submergence than after it was over, there would be formed a "Raised Beach" fronting the cliffs at a height varying from 10 to 30 feet above the present beach; then "as the land *débris* shot over the old cliffs it fell on the 'Raised Beach,' and when

the cliffs were not too high this mass of rubble entirely masked them, and formed a surface flush with the surface of the ground above the cliff." In this rubble animal remains have been found, and also delicate land-shells. There appear to be many examples of it on the south coast of England, at Cape Blanc Nez near Calais, where also some palæolithic implements have been found; at other places on the French coast, and in the Channel Islands. The term *Head* has been technically applied to it, when it forms an overlying mass in the manner just described—though it does not actually differ from the rubble on the slopes of inland hills.

This so-called "Head" does not generally contain very much in the way of organic remains, but the bones of some land animals have been found there—the Mammoth, the Woolly Rhinoceros, the Horse, the Bison, the Reindeer, the Wild Boar, the Wolf, the Spotted Hyæna, and the Bear being amongst them; land-shells have also been found, all of recent species.

To appreciate fully the evidence adduced to show the probability of the great submergence, it is necessary, of course, to read through the short treatise (for such it is) that we are reviewing; we can but give here a certain number of the principal points on which the author relies. He goes on to say that the considerations to which he has alluded, together with the circumstance that the rubble contains the remains of a *land fauna only*, have led him to infer that the south of England had been submerged "at the close of the Post-Glacial period to the depth of not less than about 1000 ft., for to that height there are traces of this rubble drift." He also infers that the submergence was comparatively slow and gradual, but the upheaval was by movements alternately slow and rapid; also that the submergence was of too short duration to allow of marine sedimentation, or of marine shells being left on the submerged area.

In France there are said to be several accumulations of what is termed "osseous breccias," one striking example occurring "near Semur, where a hill (Mont Genay) 1430 ft. high has apparently been entirely submerged, and a bank of breccia, derived from the rocks which cap its summit, and containing the remains of the Mammoth, Reindeer, Horse, &c., with land-shells, has been formed on its flanks."

Another large mass of ossiferous breccia was met with near Mentone, in a cutting of the railway, where it passes under limestone cliffs, in which is situated the cave of Baussi Roussi. In this breccia were found teeth of the Cave Bear and Spotted Hyæna, together with flints worked by Man.

In most of the instances in which we find fissures with animal remains, the hills where they are situated rise in the midst of plains or low grounds; in one case, that of the Montagne de Santenay, the height being about 1640 ft.; this is a flat-topped hill near Chalons-sur-Saône, and the question has arisen why so many wolves, bears, horses, and oxen should have ascended an isolated hill? If it was in a futile attempt to escape drowning, that makes it intelligible. The breccia to which allusion has been made "is composed of sharp angular fragments of the local rocks, imbedded in a matrix of red clay or loam, and is generally cemented by calcite." It may be added that the remains at Santenay "are evidently not those of animals devoured by beasts of prey; nor have they been broken by man." It is not credible that animals of such different natures and different habitats, as the Cave Lion, Bear, Rhinoceros, Horse, Ox, and Deer could ever in life have herded together.

Now if this widespread submergence, and the Flood which it produced, are to be accepted as facts, we may also expect to find other traces of the turbid waters on the land so submerged. And it happens that there is a sedimentary deposit called "loess," divisible into two classes—one well known to geologists and attributable to the melting of the glaciers and snow which once descended to a large extent from all the great mountain ranges of Europe: it is probable that annual inundations took place from this cause, bringing down great quantities of mud and silt, which were deposited on the flanks of the chief river valleys. This state of things existed at the close of the Glacial period, and the effects of it are to be seen in the *fluvatile loess* of the valleys of the Rhine, Danube, and other rivers.

But it appears that there is another and larger deposit of loess found on the dividing watersheds and high plains separating the river basins, in some cases at altitudes of 1300 and even 1500 ft. and more. The author holds that this was probably deposited by the ocean waters, which as they advanced

over the surface of the submerged land would take up large portions of the older fluvial loess, while at the same time the ice and snow on the mountains would melt and add their glacial silt to the mud-laden flood. On the subsequent uplift of the land, much of this sediment might be swept away by the effluent waters, but much would nevertheless remain, and present the appearance it now does: it seems, moreover, that in certain districts of Belgium the loess is impregnated with salt, which so far corroborates this hypothesis.

Professor Prestwich, however, looks upon the case of the islands of Guernsey and Jersey "as a crucial test in favour of the submergence hypothesis." These islands consist of hard slate and granitic rocks 300 or 400 ft. high, forming plateaux ending generally in high cliffs fronting the shore. A deposit of brick earth or loess is frequently found on these plateaux, and the cliffs are fringed by the remnants of a raised beach, probably in former times continuous all round the islands; the fragments now remaining are covered by a "head" from 10 to 30 ft. thick "embedded in a matrix of the loess from the plateau." To what then is this loess to be attributed? Not to inundations of rivers, for there are none; nor to rainwash, for there is no ground higher than these plateaux; nor to any glacial flood on the Continent, for Guernsey and Jersey are islands and were so at the time the deposit took place. "On the other hand, the hypothesis of a submergence perfectly meets all the conditions." The turbid waters deposited the sediment on the surface, and as the land rose again, divergent currents carried before them the more exposed portions of the loess, together with fragments of underlying rocks, and precipitated this mass of rubble over the cliffs on to the old beach below. The author gives a diagram-section showing the position of the loess and rubble-drift, and of the raised beach; and he remarks that this case of the Channel Islands "fulfils all the conditions of the problem in a way no other interpretation of the phenomena admits of."

In Spain and Portugal the traces of the raised beach and head are few, owing to the force of the Atlantic on the western coasts of the Peninsula, but they are sufficient to show that both the beach and the head were continued originally to the Straits of Gibraltar. But the Rock itself is highly instructive.

Indeed the physical history of the Rock of Gibraltar is almost as varied and eventful as its political or military record. It was in all probability in ancient times joined by a land passage to the African coast, which would account for the remains of the animals found either on the Rock or in the Quaternary deposits of Spain, such as the Spotted Hyæna, the Panther, and the Elephant; it would also perhaps, we may add, account for the still living colony of Barbary Apes, though these are not all indigenous, having been recruited in recent times by importation from Africa; subsequently the Rock was an island about 800 feet high, and rose by successive stages to its present height, which is 1370 feet above the sea. Professor Prestwich believes that the whole or greater part of the Rock was submerged, and "that as it rose again, currents swept off its surface the mass of angular *débris* spread out at its base." On the western side this *débris* now forms "in the lower grounds a breccia in some places 100 feet thick, and extending to and under the sea." The fissures that intersect the Rock have been filled with a similar breccia, in which the remains of various animals have been found, such as the Panther, Lynx, Hyæna, Wolf, Bear, Rhinoceros, Horse, Deer, Ox, and others; the bones are mostly broken into fragments, and none of them gnawed as if by carnivorous animals. It is supposed that the Deer, the Horse, and Ox lived in the adjacent plains, and that a great and common danger, such as the Flood, drove together these and the others which inhabited the crags and caves of the Rock. When the emergence took place, the *débris* consisting of disintegrated limestone formed, with the scattered remains of drowned men and animals, a huge body of rubble. There are, however, certain cavities in the older breccia in which the more recent fauna have been found, and in these cases the bones are worn and gnawed.

In Corsica and Sardinia, in Istria and in Dalmatia, similar phenomena exist, sometimes less definite in their character, also in Italy, particularly in the neighbourhood of Genoa and Leghorn; so again in south-eastern Europe and Greece, in which latter country the rubble-beds are said to be largely developed; whilst in Crete, among several raised beaches of Quaternary age, there is one 65 feet above the sea level; there is also in this island evidence that the movements of the

ground have been continued down to recent times, the west side of the island having been raised 26 feet within the historical period, and the east coast having subsided; in one place, we are told, "there is a calcareous breccia overlying a raised beach, similar to those on the coast of the English Channel."

There is, however, one large Mediterranean Island, deserving to be specially mentioned, namely Sicily: here, in the vicinity of Palermo, occurs an osseous breccia, in which have been found, together with the remains of some few other animals, an extraordinary quantity of bones of Hippopotami. "Twenty tons of these bones were shipped from around the one cave of San Ciro, near Palermo, so fresh that they were sent to Marseilles to furnish animal charcoal for use in the sugar factories." It appears that the plain of Palermo is encircled by an amphitheatre of high hills; and our author conjectures that when the island was submerged, the animals in the plain retreated, as the waters advanced, deeper into the amphitheatre of hills, crushing eventually into the more accessible caves and swarming over the ground at their entrance, until overtaken and destroyed. A few of the more agile animals may have escaped to the higher ground, the Hippopotami, however, all perishing. Then as the land emerged, rocky *débris* and large blocks from the sides of the hills were probably hurled down by the current of water, crushing and smashing the bones. The great number of Hippopotami gives strength to the conjecture made by some geologists that there was formerly a connection with Africa by an elevation of the Mediterranean area; so that this vast inland sea was once divided into two large lakes, cut off from any communication with the ocean.* The author observes that "the extremely fresh condition of the bones" and "the fact that animals of all ages were involved in the catastrophe, shows that the event was geologically comparatively recent, as other facts show it to have been sudden."

Malta appears to have been entirely submerged, not a single

* This hypothesis has been controverted on the ground that the hippopotamus is an amphibious animal and is at home in the water: that is true in the case of a river which he knows and where he is in his depth; but surely not of a vast deluge of sea-water.

genus or species of its Quaternary Mammalia being now found to be living on the island. It was then as now isolated, judging from the remains of animals found there; the escarped rocks on the south side of the island have their lower part covered with a consolidated red breccia, in which have been found remains of the pigmy elephant, which, together with a small variety of the Hippopotamus, inhabited Malta in those bygone days. Several ossiferous fissures have been discovered on the hills, containing animal remains, including fragments of bones of very large aquatic birds and of a variety of the dormouse of gigantic size.

In Asia Minor and Syria the geological phenomena above mentioned are much less striking, so far as these countries have hitherto been investigated; and Professor Prestwich raises the question whether "at this eastern end of the Mediterranean the submergence was of less importance?" In Egypt there is no distinct evidence of the submergence: and several animals that lived in western Europe and north-western Africa before the time of the rubble-drift, and disappeared afterwards, survived here in the Nile Valley to historic times, The author then supposes that it is very possible that the submergence did not extend to Egypt; though on this point he "would speak with all reserve."

On the north-western coast of Africa (including Algeria in that term) there is evidence of the same character as on the northern coasts of the Mediterranean; at Tangier there is a raised beach about 40 feet high; at Oran one of about 20 feet above the sea level, and "above this a breccia of angular fragments of slate and limestone." There are also large fissures in the limestone rocks, filled with a breccia containing animal remains. As we go eastward, beyond Tunis and Tripoli, little or no evidence of the submergence is to be found.

Professor Prestwich says nothing of those parts of Asia east of Syria and Palestine, and of the countries bordering on the Persian Gulf. We presume that they have not yet been carefully examined by competent geologists; but if the tradition of the Deluge, whether Hebrew or Chaldæan, is to be relied on, these countries are the last that we could possibly suppose to have escaped.

In concluding his statement of proof, the author anticipates an objection that may be made to the effect that you do not find *marine* deposits on the once-deluged area; but if, as he supposes, the submergence was slow the "advance of the waters would not have force sufficient to carry before them any of the objects on the shore," or even if it could do so, the turbid and de-oxidised state of the waters would have destroyed animal life, so that the remains, if any, would decay and be lost.

It is to be remarked that the waters, as they rose, failed to destroy the beaches over which they passed or to wash away the blown sands which in some places overlies the raised beaches; everything seems to show that the advance of the flood was progressive, owing to the slow and continuous sinking of the land—*slow*, that is, comparatively speaking, not in the sense that it took years to accomplish. Then after a short lull the elevatory movement commenced—most probably "by a continuous movement, sometimes very slow, and at others more or less rapid, and ending with one of greater rapidity." The force of the effluent current, sweeping animal remains and *débris* into the fissures on the surface of the land, has been already alluded to, as also has the remarkable fact that the bones in the osseous rubble and in the fissures, "mostly splintered into hundreds of fragments," are not "weathered, worn, or gnawed"—their condition in this respect differing from that which obtains in the other known drifts.

All the organic remains, properly so-called, belong to the same geological period—the late Quaternary or Pleistocene. A further proof, moreover, of the unity of the whole of the phenomena is afforded by the coincidence of the date of formation of the rents in the rocks with that of the ossiferous breccia lodged in them; for if these fissures had been open at an earlier period there would have been a lower stratum of animal remains belonging to an older type and the breccia would have been less homogeneous in character; whereas the fact is otherwise in both cases. The author therefore concludes "that the dispersion of the surface *débris*, the formation of the ossiferous fissures, the accumulation of the 'head,' and the local ablations of the rocks, are the necessary results of the submergence and subsequent re-elevation of the land."

One more very interesting question remains, and that is the probable date of this mighty catastrophe. Professor Prestwich says: "We are here confronted with very contradictory opinions." Assuming the Deluge to have occurred in Post-Glacial times, at the close of what geologists term the Palæolithic period; if we endeavour to ascertain when that was, we at once meet with a theory elaborated by the late Dr. Croll, and since then defended and in some respects amended by Sir Robert Ball. According to these writers the Glacial Period depended on astronomical considerations, which may be briefly stated thus—the length of the summer half-year in the northern hemisphere (from the March equinox to that in September) exceeds that of the winter half-year by about a week; this, however, was not always so in times past, nor will it be so in the future; owing to a curious movement of the earth's axis, similar to the reeling movement of a spinning-top, and owing also to a gradual shifting of what is termed the *line of apsides* of the earth's orbit, at a certain period which we may state as having been 10,500 years ago, it was the winter-half in our hemisphere, which was the longer one. Still, as things now are, the difference of cold and heat would not be very great; but at another period far more remote, the earth's orbit was more eccentric than it is at present, and the difference between the winter and summer halves of the year amounted to a month or more. When it happened, then (as would be the case every 10,500 years), that the northern hemisphere had, for a time of some considerable duration, year after year, so long a winter and so short a summer, notwithstanding the great heat of this latter, there might easily be such an accumulation of ice and snow extending some way south of the Polar regions, as would cause what is called the Glacial Period. Sir Robert Ball has calculated this carefully, and has shown how perfectly possible it is. It would occupy some space to go into a detailed explanation of the astronomical causes of which the facts just mentioned are the result; but they are admitted on all sides to be true in themselves, the only question being whether the Glacial Period was actually due to them, or to some geological or geographical causes of a totally different kind. Professor Prestwich says, "According to Croll's last estimate, the Glacial Period commenced 240,000 years ago, and ended with the Post-Glacial

80,000 years ago." That involves a vast interval between the Palæolithic and Neolithic times. "Were that the case," he continues, "there ought to be some geological evidence either in the form of sedimentary deposits, or of work done in the excavation of valleys; I fail to find either" . . . "the stratigraphical evidence shows that they follow quickly in immediate succession. The deposits of the two periods [Palæolithic and Neolithic] are, in fact, separated merely by a few feet (and that only in places) of rubble drift from one another;" and this drift, he explains, requires but a short time for its formation.

Now if the lapse of time since the formation of this detrital bed were known, we might arrive at the approximate date of the great submergence. One scale of measurement the author finds in the Alluvial beds of the valley of the Thames and others in the South of England; and though there is great difficulty in making an accurate estimate, he infers that the age of these Alluvial beds "is to be measured not by tens of thousands but by tens of hundreds of years."

The extent of denudation or wearing back of the rubble-drift of the "head," which has been caused by the action of the sea since it was first formed, offers a better scale for calculating time. Not that any really accurate estimate can be formed even so; but a fairly good approximation may be made if we know the extent that the coast-line has receded since the great submergence, and also if we know the present rate of wear of the cliffs. Professor Prestwich estimates this latter at something between one and three feet annually, and the loss of land on the South Coast, generally speaking, at a breadth between one and two miles; this, however, is in districts occupied by soft cretaceous and other strata; where there are hard Palæozoic rocks, the extent of wear of the land is very much less: putting all together then, he computes that the total loss of land would come between the limits of 6000 and 12,000 years: "these tentative estimates," he further states, "are in accordance with the conclusion I had arrived at on other grounds, that the Glacial (including the Post-Glacial) Period together with the Palæolithic man, came within 10,000 to 12,000 years of our own time." He adds to this an observation that some of the most eminent American geologists,

judging from independent data of a different character, have formed an opinion "that the Glacial Period came down to within 8000 to 10,000 years of our times."

These figures form a startling contrast to those which recorded the immense periods of time demanded by the Uniformitarian School of Geologists, who some thirty years ago seemed to be carrying everything before them. Dr. Croll, who was an able man, moderate and reasonable in his opinions in other ways, put the Post-Glacial period as far back as 80,000 years; while Professor Prestwich, as we have just seen, brings it down to some time between 10,000 and 12,000 years from our own era.

We presume, too, that the arguments which have been used for the great antiquity of man upon the earth will be considerably modified by these revised estimates of time; but this is a wide question, and one into which we must not now enter, as it forms no part of our present inquiry.

In conclusion, the author of this really remarkable treatise calls our attention to the coincidence of the facts he has laid before us, as also of some other phenomena, with the events recorded in the "narrative of the Flood, whether in the Biblical or Babylonian versions." There is the same *apparent* gradual rise of the waters, caused, in fact, by the slow and imperceptible sinking of the land; the same extensive destruction of life; and the transient character of the submergence. That man lived then on the earth is now a well-established fact; for although only a comparatively small quantity of human remains have been discovered, the existence of man in various places during the Quaternary period has been revealed by the stone tools and weapons that he employed. Man, therefore, must have largely shared the fate of the numerous animals that perished in the waters.

In allusion to the attempt made by some writers—of whom, we may remark, the late Professor Huxley was one—to account for the tradition of the Deluge by supposing it to have originated in one of those inundations, of exceptionally great extent, that occur periodically in the valley of the Euphrates, Professor Prestwich points out the inadequacy of this explanation. There is no record of such a flood in recent or historical times; and in the valley of the Euphrates, where annual inundations causing a rise of the river from about 17 to 22 feet, do

really happen, the towns and villages are generally built on rising ground, so as to avoid danger and disaster. In fact, no river-flood, however devastating, could have left such a deep and lasting impression on the people, as the tradition clearly indicates.

Such, then, is the judgment of this learned and able geologist; and such the evidence on which it is based. We have endeavoured, at the risk of wearying the patience of our readers, to give a fair *précis* of the author's arguments, to some extent in his own words, because the importance of the subject fully justified us in doing so, and because we were thus enabled to give a far better statement of the case than we could have done by casting it in words of our own into the form of an independent or critical essay. Geology is one of those sciences which cannot be grasped properly by mere students of books; others may be so, as, for instance, physical astronomy, which can be mastered within the four walls of a study by any thoroughly competent mathematician; but to be a good geologist you must go out with hammer and chisel into the fields and river-valleys and amongst the rocks. We leave then to others the task of criticising the details of Professor Prestwich's arguments; and we do not doubt that this will be performed, more or less, by some of the remaining adherents of the Uniformitarian School of Geology. One objection will, perhaps, be taken on account of the very great extent of the submergence which the hypothesis involves; but if, as the author thinks, the crust of the earth was, at the time, in a very mobile condition—far more so than at present—this circumstance would greatly reduce the difficulty of supposing it. The only other natural cause which we can imagine for a great deluge, and that by no means a certain one, is a sudden and important shifting of the earth's axis of rotation: this might result in a great flow of water towards the (new) equatorial regions and a very extensive though transitory deluge; but the general, though not universal, opinion of astronomers and other scientific men is that no important change in the position of the earth's axis of rotation has ever taken place.* Unless then we are prepared

* We say *important* because there is a minute displacement constantly going on of the axis of rotation, which does not coincide exactly with the earth's axis of figure, round which it seems to perform a periodical revolution. We

to discard not only the Scriptural record of the Deluge, but also the widely extended tradition of its occurrence, it appears to us that we have no alternative but to accept Professor Prestwich's hypothesis. We must, of course, remember that our author, with that prudence and modesty which are distinctive notes of the true scientific spirit, avoids dogmatising on such a subject and presents his case as a hypothesis, but one which there is every reason to believe to be true, since the consequences resulting from the supposition of its truth have, as he tells us, agreed in a remarkable manner with the observed facts. That the inferences he has drawn will be disputed by other geologists we do not doubt; indeed, as we write, we notice that a brief criticism (expressed in friendly and respectful language) has already appeared in a scientific paper, and some explanations have been suggested, differing from those which he has given. We must, however, always bear in mind what the position of the author is, how much he undertakes to prove, how much he does not undertake. It is obvious from the very nature of the case that a rigid demonstration is not to be expected; but Professor Prestwich brings to bear upon the question that power of inductive reasoning by which so many truths in physical science have been established. The tradition of the Flood exists and has to be accounted for: a number of geological phenomena also exist, and can be well explained by a certain theory—namely, a subsidence of the land on a very extensive scale and a consequent in-rush of the sea; followed after a brief interval by the emergence of the land. If, then, such a hypothesis meets the requirements both of the tradition and of the geological record, it must surely be allowed to possess a high degree of probability. Supposing even some of the phenomena in question can be well explained in other ways, that may indeed lessen the force of the argument in detail, but yet not really militate against the conclusion. The fact that many astronomical phenomena can be explained, and indeed have been explained, by the old system of Ptolemy, has not prevented the triumphant establishment of the Copernican theory of the earth's motion.

believe that the cause of this curious phenomenon has not yet been satisfactorily explained.

The points to which we have alluded must, of course, be left to the judgment of professed geologists; but we may venture to say that we do not ourselves believe that the arguments of a man of so great experience and ability as Professor Prestwich will be seriously shaken even in detail. It is almost needless to remark how deeply we regret the manner in which he alludes to the Scriptural narrative; we, as Catholics, regard it as the genuine history of this great event, whilst we consider the Babylonian and other versions to be corruptions of the original tradition, in so far as they differ in any essential respect, such as the introduction of polytheism, from the record of Holy Scripture. At the same time, as we have already observed, we value highly the independent testimony which our author has borne to the substantial truth of the story; of which we may truly say that, varied though its details may have been in passing through the hands of tribes and nations differing in religion and customs, it yet receives a concurrence of testimony from them all, sufficient to show that the Flood was no mere local inundation of the Euphrates or any other river, but rather a physical catastrophe of vast magnitude, such as at no other time has ever befallen mankind. In conclusion, we venture to say that we expect one good result from the publication of Professor Prestwich's treatise, and that is that the flippant style of speaking of the Deluge, said to have been adopted in recent times by some who might, one would suppose, have known better, will henceforth be dropped; and another still greater advantage in the lesson which good and faithful Christians may here learn, not to allow their belief in the sacred records to be lightly undermined by plausible theories advanced in the name of science, but to wait patiently till the apparent difficulties have been solved by fuller investigation; and lastly, we hope that not even Protestant missionaries will, as in the well-known instance of Bishop Colenso, permit their confidence in the scriptural narrative to be shaken by the crude scepticism of a Zulu disciple.

F. R. WEGG-PROSSER.

ART. IX.—THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES AND THE REFORMATION.

Die Universitäten Englands im 16 Jahrhundert. Von ATHANASIUS ZIMMERMANN, S.J. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder. 1889.

The Romanes Lecture, 1892. An Academic Sketch. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1892.

THE decision of the Holy See of April 2, 1895,* removing the ecclesiastical embargo hitherto laid upon the access of our Catholic students to the national universities will mark the beginning of a new epoch in the history of Catholic education, or, to put it perhaps more correctly, indicates the closing of an era which has lasted for some three centuries. It will be fittingly recorded in history as signalling the same year of grace which has seen the publication of the Apostolic Letter, "Ad Anglos." We are much too near both events to properly appreciate their significance and probable results. We cannot be mistaken in thinking that both will one day be estimated as of unusual magnitude.

At any rate, the mind is irresistibly carried back, across the desolate span of three hundred years of prescription and persecution, to the times when the two national universities were not only accessible to Catholic students, but were themselves Catholic institutions in as true a sense as Louvain and Washington and Fribourg are at the present day. To some minds this will not be so easy to realise. Every Catholic boy and girl knows how we have been robbed of our grand old cathedrals, and a visit to Canterbury, York, or Lincoln recalls memories of a glorious past, associated with a keen sense of loss, even to the least imaginative mind. But somehow or other we seem almost to have forgotten that Oxford and Cambridge are as truly lost heirlooms of our Church, so identified have they become with the ideas of Protestantism,

* *Tablet*, April 27, 1895, p. 647.

or even of free-thought and scepticism. Yet the material and artistic loss of our beautiful cathedrals, great as it was, has been far less than the intellectual loss of the ancient seats of learning, the homes of culture and the national schools of theology. It seems appropriate at this juncture to rehearse the sad history of the process by which these national universities were lost to the Catholic Church, not without a long and gallant struggle. To do this in a brief and commodious manner, we purpose to select as our guide the short and excellent monograph of Father Zimmermann, S.J., published already some six years ago, but which, like too many admirable publications of its kind bearing upon English church history, has not yet found a translator in England or America.* Father Zimmermann will prove a conscientious and reliable guide. He has diligently utilised the best sources of information up to the time of his writing—Father Gasquet's star had not yet appeared above the horizon—and, as every page shows, has carefully and critically digested both the older authorities, like Wood, Cooper, Dugdale, or Spelman, and the modern ones, like Mullinger, Brewer, Bridgett, or Seeböhm. This will serve as an excuse for presenting in this paper little more than the summary of a book, itself not exceeding one hundred and forty pages in extent.

I.

Mr. Gladstone's curious and ingenious contention in his brilliant Romanes Lecture that the universities of the early Middle Ages were the outcome of "a great systematic effort [of the] lay mind to achieve self-assertion and emancipation,"†

* There is ample opening for the publication of a whole library of valuable monographs, for instance, on English Churchmen, translated from foreign languages. I will instance only a few:—Abbé Martin, "St. Etienne Harding et les premiers Recenseurs de la Vulgate" (Amiens, 1887); "La Vulgate latine d'après Roger Bacon" (Paris, 1888); and ["Etienne Langton et] le Texte parisien de la Vulgate" (in the *Muséon*, 1889-90); Dr. J. Felten, "Robert Grosseteste, Bischof von Lincoln" (Freiburg i. B., 1887); Dr. K. Werner, "Beda der Ehrwürdige und seine Zeit." (Wien, 1875); "Alcuin und sein Jahrhundert" (Paderborn, 1876); Alberdingk Thijm, "H. Willibrordus Apostel der Nederlanden" (Amsterdam, 1861). Here are able and scholarly studies, all comparatively short, of seven great English Churchmen, all well deserving of translation and publication. It seems a pity they should not be better known and utilised in this country.

† P. 10.

as against the predominance of ecclesiasticism, hardly commended itself at the time to his hearers,* and probably will not do so to his readers at the present moment. It is, indeed, highly probable that the early universities, like Topsy, mostly "grewed." Zimmermann altogether discountenances the old-fashioned idea that they were a continuation of either the old cathedral or monastic schools, from which they differed not only in the subjects and methods of study, but still more in their entire organisation. Mr. Gladstone opines that the Papal authority "may" have been used "as a defensive measure to keep in check the separate action of the lay element." But although it may be true enough that the very earliest universities, such as Salerno or Bologna, as well as Oxford and Cambridge—ten altogether, according to Mr. Gladstone—were called into existence before either papal or regal authority began to intervene, yet there does not seem to be much evidence for the supposed organised system of "emancipation." The more probable solution appears to be that these schools, sprung from what Mr. Gladstone more happily styles "professional exigencies," were at first under local episcopal control. Green, indeed, by whom Mr. Gladstone seems to some extent to have been influenced, points out that at first the Chancellor of Oxford was simply the local officer of the Bishop of Lincoln;† but that later on, "Popes, seeing in them the possibility of an intellectual tool and weapon that the Church needed, gave them privileges and immunities."‡ Be this as it may, the early

* "Unless the accepted view in these matters has been modified by very recent researches, the accepted view is not quite that of Mr. Gladstone," is the sensible criticism of a very scholarly article in the *Manchester Guardian* of October 25, 1892, evidently from an able but anonymous pen.

† "History of the English People," book iii. chap. i. (Library edition, vol. i. p. 205.)

‡ The most recent, as well as the most complete statement of the origins of the European universities before 1400 is that of the great historian of these universities, Father Denifle, O.P. His conclusions may thus be summed up. Four categories may be made according to the manner of foundation—(1st) the eleven which arose without any formal diploma of foundation, some of these being the outcome of pre-existing ecclesiastical schools; among these are some of the most illustrious of all, including Paris, Bologna, and Oxford. (2nd) Sixteen created exclusively by papal diploma, among which Denifle places Cambridge. (3rd) Ten created exclusively by imperial and royal charters. (4th) Nine, created simultaneously by both papal and royal decrees ("Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400," von H. Denifle, vol. i. pp. xlv, 814). These significant statistics confirm the truth of Paulsen's dictum: "In the erection of the universities there was formerly absolute liberty, not outside of the Church, but inside the Church, and the Church blessed without reserve

English universities, although true "republics of letters," were thoroughly Catholic institutions, and for all practical purposes may be styled ecclesiastical ones. The famous "secession" of the students in 1209 is the first certain date in the history of Oxford, whose foundation almost certainly preceded that of Cambridge. From the first the history of both universities was intimately bound up with all that was best and holiest in the English Church. The Oxford career of St. Edmund Rich, so beautifully told by Green,* falls between 1219 and 1226, and it was the saint of Abingdon who first taught Aristotle at Oxford. But it is more especially with the coming of the friars of the Orders of both St. Dominic and St. Francis that the early glories of Oxford are so intimately bound up. It was immediately after his second general Chapter in 1221 that Brother Dominic despatched his first party of friars to England, and it was at Oxford, at the Feast of the Assumption, that they first settled and opened schools. Very soon learned men flocked to their Order, including Robert Bacon, uncle or brother of the still more famous Roger, and his dearest friend, Richard Fishacre, "the most learned among the learned," as Ireland calls him, and who ever carried the works of Aristotle in his bosom; also Robert Kilwardby, eminent as philosopher and theologian, a future Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal; and John of St. Giles, called by Matthew Paris "a man skilful in the art of medicine, a great professor of divinity, and excellently learned." In 1229 took place another curious "secession" of students, this time to Oxford, from the mother-University of Paris, as a protest against the violation of certain privileges. Among these were the Dominicans of St. James' Convent, and with them their General, Blessed Jordan, who wrote to the nuns at Bologna, "Our Lord gives me hopes of making a good capture in the University of Oxford, where I now am." The Dominicans, indeed, contributed some of its brightest ornaments to the university.† But, as Mr. Gladstone points out,

and with equal affection both the good she did herself and the good which was done in her" (see P. Berthier, O.P., "*Projets anciens des hautes Etudes catholiques en Suisse*").

* *Op. cit.*

† See the late Mother Augusta Theodosia Drane's admirable "History of St. Dominic," chap. xxxii. pp. 442-446, on the Friars Preachers at Oxford.

the greatest names belonging to Oxford in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are not of the Order of Saint Dominic, to whom Dante awards the intellectual brightness of the cherub (*Paradiso*, xi, 39-41), but in the ranks of the seraphic Francis, who could not abide the world, even in its academic form.*

The Franciscan Order [he says elsewhere] gave to Oxford the larger number of those remarkable, and even epoch-making men, who secured for this university such a career of glory in mediæval times.† These men were men of English birth. But the fame of their school was such that Franciscans flocked to it, not only from Scotland and Ireland, but from France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Germany.

The most famous of these luminaries whom Mr. Gladstone cites in his generous eulogium on the Oxford Friars Minor, were Alexander of Hales, Adam Marsh, Archbishop Peckham, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, and, greatest of all, "perhaps, the most striking British intellect of the Middle Ages," the earlier and the greater of the two Bacons, Roger.‡ Mr. Gladstone goes on to point out how the fame of the early Oxford Franciscans was consecrated by "that superlative distinction" of a special epithet attached to their names, "coin of European rather than of British currency," such as "Doctor irrefragabilis" (Alexander of Hales), "Doctor subtilis" (Scotus), "Doctor mirabilis" (Bacon), and others.§ Thus it was that the very foundations of Oxford's greatness, which won for her already, as early as 1252, the epithet "aemula Parisiensis," are owing to the two mendicant Orders,|| not merely for their own scientific achievements, but also because they stimulated by their example the secular and regular clergy. Very soon the Bishops and the Benedictines had founded colleges at Oxford. Merton, the first Oxford college, dates from 1264; the first Cambridge foundation was Peterhouse, 1274.

I have dwelt perhaps too long upon these early facts, but my object is to emphasise the essentially Catholic character of our

* *Op. cit.* p. 18. The Franciscans came to Oxford in 1225.

† *Op. cit.* p. 12.

‡ Sir John Herschel, Mr. Lewis (quoted by Mr. Gladstone), and, we may add, Prof. Jevons ("Logic," p. 229), estimate Roger above his famous namesake, Francis Lord Bacon. The same estimate of the great Franciscan is warmly maintained by Mr. J. Vellin Marmery in his book only just published, entitled "Progress of Science; its Origin, Course, Promoters, and Results" (London: Chapman & Hall, 1895), in which he spiritedly defends the Middle Ages from the old-fashioned charge of intellectual stagnation.

§ *Op. cit.* p. 19.

|| *Op. cit.* p. 17.

national universities from their inception. The same is true from the point of view of their character of discipline, so unlike what they have come to be in these last three centuries. To begin with, the ancient university offered access to the poor, even to the very poor. The penniless student athirst for knowledge was not an object of contempt, but was on a perfect level with the richest and the noblest. His life was hard enough, though he generally had sufficiency of food, and there were many charitable foundations to assist, not to pauperise, him. The discipline was severe.* The course was much longer, seven years' study was required to reach the Master's degree. Theology took ten years. The student was not merely receptive. On attaining his degree he was obliged himself to teach "cursorie." Public disputations were frequent, as still in Catholic universities and seminaries abroad. This system may have had its weak points, but it was well suited to the times. It may be questioned whether we are not slowly coming back to some part at least of the old ways of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries.

The opening of the fifteenth century was characterised, as our own days, by a remarkable devotion to learning on the part of the lower classes. A statute of 1406 laid down the grand principle, which the nineteenth century believes itself to have established, that it is free to any man, of whatever social rank he may be, to have his son or daughter educated in any school of the kingdom. Numerous colleges were founded during the century: Lincoln, 1427; All Souls, Magdalen, 1457; King's, 1440; Queen's, 1458; Catherine Hall, 1475; Jesus, 1497. Henry VI. and his queen were special patrons of the universities. Let it be remembered that colleges at this time were really charitable foundations to aid poorer students, and in each case established out of pious motives, for God's glory and to obtain prayers and masses for the souls of the founders. During this century also began the close connection between the universities and the great public schools, such as Winchester and Eton, so that "young men at the English universities were better prepared than elsewhere."†

* As late as 1540 undergraduates could receive the birch-rod! (Zimmerrmann, p. 65.)

† Zimmermann, p. 8. To the same writer we are also indebted for an [No. 16 of *Fourth Series*.]

The close of the century saw the rise of "Humanism," or the "New Learning," the cradle of which was in Italy. Oxford men, like Robert Fleming, William Grey, John Gunthorp, John Free, Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, and William Selling, O.S.B., went to Italy to become learners. In 1488, three Italian humanists, one of whom was Cornelio Vitelli, were at Oxford, boarding at Magdalen College. Vitelli taught Greek to Grocyn, perhaps also to Linacre. Both these great English humanists were good and zealous Catholics. Grocyn was an ascetic, devout man, much attached to the scholastic philosophy. Linacre, distinguished for his studies in medicine, and worthy of record as the founder and first president of the Royal College of Physicians, was no less celebrated for his piety, and late in life (1509) became a priest. The illustrious pupils of Grocyn and Linacre were Erasmus and Sir Thomas More. Other eminent names among the Oxford humanists of the day were William Latimer and William Lyly, and, above all, John Colet. A Londoner (b. 1466), Colet visited Italy for purposes of study, but his strongly ascetic mind saw and realised more easily than many others the intellectual and moral dangers of the New Learning, of which, however, he himself became one of the brightest ornaments. In 1496 he returned to Oxford, and soon gained great fame and influence by his eloquence and learning, not only in Greek, but also in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. Next year we find the famous Erasmus of Rotterdam at Oxford, studying Greek under Grocyn and Linacre. Together with his friend More, with their two teachers, with Charnock and Colet, he formed the never-to-be-forgotten coterie of classical scholars which graced Oxford at the close of the fifteenth century. Up to this, as Mr. Gladstone is justified in claiming, Oxford had far and away surpassed her sister of Cambridge, giving to England nearly all her great theologians, bishops, and statesmen. Cambridge seems to have been marked by a kind of apathy. Even in Greek learning, scarce one or two names of note can be recorded.

During the following century, however, things altered, and

eventually, at least as regards humanities, the positions were almost reversed. Cambridge owes her awakening almost entirely to Blessed John Fisher. It would be useless here to repeat the well-known story of his life. Suffice it to say that, born in 1469, he entered Cambridge in 1483. As confessor of the Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond, the pious mother of Henry VII., he was soon able to exercise great influence in favour of his Alma Mater. To him is owing a novel institution, the establishment of salaried professorships, independent of the colleges. The Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity was founded at this time. The university awoke to new life and activity. In 1503, Pope Alexander VI. empowered the Chancellor to send out yearly twelve priests, either doctors of divinity or M.A.s, to preach all over England, Ireland, and Scotland. The next year Fisher himself became Chancellor. In 1506 Erasmus, probably induced by the new Chancellor, came to Cambridge. The great humanist does not appear to have had the gifts of a successful teacher. His great faults of character, too, his vanity, frivolity, love of ridicule and invective, all of which render his testimony about his contemporaries eminently suspect, might, but for the goodwill of Fisher, have led to unpleasant strife at Cambridge. Fisher esteemed his real talents, and wishing to utilise them for the Church, avoided doing anything to drive him into the hostile camp. Several eminent men at the university, Bullock, Gonell, Bryan, Aldrich, Watson, were among his pupils, and others were encouraged by him to take up the study of Greek. Fisher himself in 1518, then in his fiftieth year, learnt Greek. Thus, as the classical studies began to decline at Oxford, they grew in favour at Cambridge.

Whilst Fisher was thus making himself the real father of the greatness of Cambridge, three well-known Churchmen were doing much for Oxford. The first of these was Fox, Bishop of Winchester, than whom few prelates have merited better of the universities. The college of Corpus Christi, founded by him, shows in its statutes the strong influences of the Renaissance. Great stress was laid upon the reading of the classical authors. Scarcely less important was the influence of Archbishop Warham and of Cardinal Wolsey, of whom it will be necessary to speak later, when on the subject of the great religious separation. In several important points, Wolsey displayed

really marvellous breadth of view. He munificently endowed professorships, and one of the men he brought to Oxford to fill a chair was the celebrated Louis Vives. Still more remarkable was Wolsey's grandiose scheme of establishing schools in all the chief towns of the country, as preparatory schools for the universities. His foundation of Cardinal College, which he was never able to complete, and which scarce survived his fall, is too well known to repeat here. He has been severely blamed by Protestant and Catholic writers alike, from Spelman to Mullinger, for his action in utilising the revenues of the suppressed minor monasteries to endow his college. Zimmermann, however, is inclined to defend him, and invokes Pope Clement VII., whose permission was granted for the purpose, as had been done in other cases of a similar kind. Wolsey's misfortune (he thinks) was to have had such a tool as Thoma Crumwell to employ for the purpose.*

But Oxford had fallen upon evil times. To begin with, visitations of sore disease well-nigh threatened her existence. From 1509 to 1528 constant outbreaks of epidemics, generally the dreaded "sweating sickness," drove away the students in crowds. More tells us in 1523 that the abbots had almost ceased to send their monks to the university; neither the nobleman would send his sons, nor the parish priest his subjects or kinsfolk. Many hostels were altogether closed. This sad state of things was doubtless owing to the unhealthy position of the city and its shocking sanitary arrangements, or rather utter want of sanitation. Vives complains bitterly of the unhealthiness of the place.

Intellectual dissensions also broke out with considerable bitterness. It is a reproach to be made against the early humanists that, in the pride of their New Learning, they too often showed themselves narrow-minded, insolent, and overbearing, and affected contemptuous scorn of the scholastic philosophy, chiefly on account of their own ignorance of anything outside the narrow circle of their own philological and literary studies. At first they seem to have been received by the theologians and philosophers with good-humour and deference,

* Zimmermann, p. 24. But see Gasquet, "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," vol. i. pp. 78 *sqq.*

but later on the opposition of the theologians to the New Learning was stimulated to regrettable exaggeration. So arose the feud between the "Greeks" and the "Trojans," as the anti-humanists came to call themselves. More had to invoke the intervention of the King, and Greek was at last duly recognised as a regular branch of study.

Such was the state of things at the national universities at the dawn of the dark day of the religious troubles under Henry VIII.

II.

Mr. Gladstone does but formulate the universal verdict of history when he tells us that in the new epoch which now opened Cambridge was to become the cradle of English Protestantism,* to which we may add that Oxford was long to remain the citadel of English Catholicism.† This fact is not without its explanation. Wycliffism, it must be remembered, was still existent in the country as a religious party, and its home was chiefly in the eastern counties. These counties, moreover, owing to their geographical situation, were in easy and constant communication with the Netherlands and Germany. It cannot surprise us, then, that in these districts the writings of Luther and other Continental "reformers" came to be circulated by the agency of booksellers, bankrupt traders, and various kinds of smugglers. They made their way soon enough to the University of Cambridge. As early as 1517 Luther seems to have found there an imitator in his denunciation of indulgences. This was a Norman, Peter de Valence, who was eventually publicly excommunicated by the Chancellor, Bishop Fisher, and who, though not an Englishman, may be claimed as the first English Protestant. The first head of the Protestant party was, however, the talented, but eccentric, and (like Luther) originally scrupulous, "Little Bilney," who by a secret propaganda won over by degrees to the Lutheran doctrine a knot of men: Arthur, fellow of St. John's; Smith, a doctor of canon law; Forman, of Queen's, and one or two others. But his most celebrated conquest was that of Robert

* "Romanes Lecture," pp. 23-25.

† Zimmermann, p. 31.

Barnes, prior of the Augustinians. Both Bilney and Barnes, it is worth noting, were Norfolk men. Barnes had been a student of Louvain, and was an enthusiastic humanist. His worldly and lax character would seem to have little fitted him for a "reformer," but he really became the leader of the party. It is remarked that, at least for the present, these English Lutherans did not go so far as Luther himself in all points, refraining, for instance, from attacks on the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Bilney's next successful move, the winning over of Hugh Latimer, was of a character very shocking to a Catholic mind. He went to confession to Latimer, and under the pretext of seeking advice in his mental and spiritual doubts, difficulties, and trials, succeeded in winning the confidence and esteem of Latimer, who seems to have been up to this of a guileless and unsuspecting nature, and hitherto had enjoyed the reputation of piety and strict orthodoxy. Very soon he was entirely under Bilney's influence and guidance. Latimer's character does not certainly seem to have gained by the new direction under which he fell. Duplicity and a decided want of steadfastness are stamped on his subsequent career. Summoned before Bishop West, of Ely, to answer for preaching Lutheran doctrine, he declared that he knew nothing about Luther's teachings, as it was forbidden to read his books. In 1531 we find him, after some show of manful resistance, on his knees at Lambeth, admitting having preached error, declaring that his hasty speech had led him into errors and want of discretion, and begging pardon for the scandal caused. Two years later he was again accused of the same errors, and declared he had been misunderstood. Arthur and Bilney, too, after some hesitation, are found recanting their errors; and, altogether, these early English Protestants show a decided want of constancy and much moral weakness as compared with their predecessors, the Lollards.

It is difficult to explain Wolsey's want of firmness and foresight at this juncture. When Barnes and Latimer were cited before him, he not only, led astray by Latimer's skilful pleading, reversed Bishop West's prohibition to preach, but with his legatine power gave him general faculty to preach everywhere.

From Cambridge the infection of the Lutheran heresy was

carried to Oxford in 1526, by a small band of students, whose leader seems to have been one John Clarke. The importation of the dangerous doctrines into his own university alarmed Wolsey, and roused him at last into some activity.

The curious history of the attempts to arrest Thomas Garrett of Magdalen, the most zealous propagator of the writings of the Continental reformers, as related by his friend Dalaber, is a tragic-comic story of adventures. Dalaber himself does not come very honourably out of it; for we find him, when brought up before Dr. Loudon, the head of New College, whom he styles "the worst Papist Pharisee of all," himself playing a highly discreditable part. After long opposition he finally promised, and even swore on the mass-book, to answer according to the truth, "but in his heart resolved the opposite." He ended by betraying his twenty-two companions, and was then set at liberty. On the other hand, it impresses us unpleasantly to find the University Commissioner, Dr. Cottisford, having recourse to an astrologer to find out the whereabouts of the fugitive Garrett! * The latter being eventually incarcerated, wrote a suppliant letter, begging not so much for delivery from the fetters he had merited, as from the terrible fetters of excommunication. † Several of the other innovators were apprehended, but the authorities displayed considerable mildness in their treatment of them. Dr. Higdon (Dean of Cardinal College), who himself caused their apprehension, writes to Wolsey begging for absolution for them and permission to make their Easter duties. Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, apparently expecting their amendment, also pleaded for them. More than a dozen of these suspects took part in the penitential procession from St. Mary's to St. Flisdeswyde's, and as they pass the *Carfax* cast there a book into the fire. Foxe's harrowing tales in his *Book of Martyrs* about noisome underground dungeons and salt food are manifestly apocryphal. ‡ Three of them died in August of the sweating sickness, and seem to have shown some repentance. Altogether, as before remarked, these early Protestants did not display much of the stuff of which martyrs are made.

* Zimmermann, p. 41.

† "Letters and Papers" (Brewer), iv. 1804.

‡ Zimmermann, p. 42.

More than this, men of the eloquence of Luther or the wide learning of Melanchthon, were wanting in their ranks. Some of them were coarse and vulgar in their expression, and not likely to exercise much influence among the more cultured. Indeed, the whole movement would probably have died out, without leaving any appreciable traces, as it did in Italy and Spain, but for the lamentable affair of the Royal Divorce—that true *fons et origo malorum* of the English Church. The effects of the divorce case may be thus summed up in a sentence: the numerically and intellectually weaker party got the upper hand, and the universities were reduced to a state of servitude.

It was in 1530, two years after the events just narrated, that Henry VIII., being determined upon his divorce from Queen Catherine, appealed to the two universities for a favourable decision. From what has gone before, we can hardly wonder that he appealed first to Cambridge. Cranmer, Fox, and Gardiner, his chief tools in the matter, were Cambridge men. It is remarkable that the older men were inclined to yield to the very urgent arguments of the King; the younger held out more manfully. Now every kind of pressure was brought to bear. The King's party, not daring to challenge a vote of the university at large, brought about the appointment of a Special Commission. But even in this Commission, partial as it was, things did not go smoothly; and the final decision that was extorted ran thus: "*Ducere uxorem fratris mortui sine liberis, cognitam a priori viro per carnalem copulam, est prohibitum iure divino ac naturali.*" Practically the verdict was dead against the King, for it was exactly the consummation of the marriage with Prince Arthur that was steadfastly denied by the Queen. We know, therefore, what value to attach to Froude's eulogy of the spirit of independence and liberality of Cambridge in favouring the divorce,* as compared with the narrow-mindedness of Oxford. As a matter of fact, both the national seats of learning rejected it.†

Oxford, however, was certainly much more strongly Catholic, and so remained for several generations. And whilst the Protestant party was very unpopular there, the party of the Queen

* "History of England," i. 257-262.

† Zimmermann, p. 44.

was especially popular. Mr. Gladstone is correct in maintaining that

there was a difference in the prevalent theological cast of the two universities. Oxford was on the losing side. . . . It might be said, without any great perversion of historical truth, that in the sixteenth century the deepest and most vital religious influences within the two universities respectively were addressed at Oxford to the making of recusants, at Cambridge to the production of Zwinglians and Calvinists.*

No wonder that extraordinary efforts were made by Henry to coerce the Oxford intellect and will. The younger generation here again, especially the Arts men, held out gallantly, and drew down the royal wrath, expressed in no measured language in his letters. He concludes by reminding them, in words which recall our Latin exercise books, "non est bonum irritare crabrones."† Unfortunately, it must be admitted that the part played by Archbishop Warham in this matter was a discreditable one. He did not hesitate to assert that the Universities of Cambridge and Paris had already pronounced in favour of the divorce, which was a falsehood. Cambridge's decision we have seen above; that of Paris had not been given at the time. After this, we can scarcely be surprised at Henry's false citation, in his letter of March 17, of the Cambridge decision, by *simply omitting the crucial clause italicised* in our quotation above.

In spite of all, of King and Primate, and even of the threatened weakness of the theological faculty under tremendous pressure, it is refreshing to find the M.A.s holding out gallantly. After eight weeks' strenuous contest and every kind of intrigue, nothing further could be squeezed out of the university than a decision practically equivalent to that of Cambridge—for which, of course, Oxford falls in for the censures of Mr. Froude.‡

Henry's wrath descended heavily on the university, whose great Chancellor, Cardinal Wolsey, had already fallen into disgrace in the preceding October. It was his famous college, Cardinal College, that was to feel the full fury of the storm.

* "Romanes Lecture," p. 25.

† Letter of March 6, Zimmermann, p. 46.

‡ "History of England," i. p. 279.

And after various efforts to ward off the blow, spoliation and suppression rapidly followed one another—perhaps among the bitterest of the dregs that the fallen Chancellor had to drink.

Five years later the great Chancellor and benefactor of the sister university, Blessed John Fisher, died the martyr's death upon the scaffold (June 22, 1535). Unlike Wolsey and Warham, the saintly bishop had early on foreseen the dangers for the English Church which the spread of the Lutheran heresy only too surely threatened; but his warnings had been unheeded by these mighty prelates. His own services to Cambridge slackened not until the end. His new statutes, to some extent borrowed from Oxford, were directed partly to elevating the level of the studies, partly to remedying the ever-growing indiscipline and recklessness of the rising generation. He is therefore very far from meriting the charge of narrow-mindedness which even Mullinger makes against him;* and not only St. John's College, as that historian truly claims, but the whole university, may justly look back with gratitude and pride to Bishop Fisher as the greatest of her benefactors.

The remaining years of Henry, from 1535 to 1547, are rightly summed up by Father Zimmermann, in reference to our subject, as the epoch of the plundering and enslaving of the universities. The meanness and greed which disgraced the policy of the latter years of the reign, do not always, or even generally, mark the policy of the "Turkish Sultans," to whom Zimmermann compares him. Henry has been praised as a patron of the universities, and a declaration of his is often quoted, to the effect that no foundations are more to the general good than those in favour of colleges, and sharply discriminating between the universities and the monasteries. There is good reason to suspect the sincerity of these expressions, and to believe that a systematic spoliation of the universities was originally intended to follow in due course that of the monasteries. In spite of his foundation of Trinity, Cambridge, from purely political motives, Henry cannot be said to have esteemed either learning or learned men for their own sake.† But what is a much more serious charge, is that his policy was directed to a systematic enthraldom of the intellect.

* Vol. i. p. 624.

† Zimmermann, pp. 53, 54, 67.

Never were independent thought and freedom of research so much kept in fetters as at this epoch. The King's changeableness of disposition and views rendered this mental servitude the more galling. The universities were called upon to change the opinions they had to defend according to the royal humour. Thomas Crumwell was made Visitor of both the Universities, and an elaborate document, containing detailed instructions, was drawn up, which Zimmermann analyses. The first article expressly stipulates that the members of the university are to promise obedience not only to the rules of succession established by the King, but also to all statutes directed to the uprooting of the Papal claims and the confirmation of the King's supreme authority. No lectures were to be permitted upon the Master of Sentences and his commentators; only the Old and New Testament in their literal sense were to be expounded. This was, of course, directed to the abolition of the scholastic philosophy and theology. Both lectures and degrees in canon law were to be abolished, "as all England(!) had acknowledged the ecclesiastical supremacy of the King." Melancthon's name is inserted among the authors to be expounded in philosophy. All heads of houses and professors must swear obedience to these new statutes. Two pliant tools, Dr. Layton and Dr. Legh, were deputed in place of their master, Crumwell, as Visitors, to Oxford and Cambridge respectively. Then followed a veritable panic, a reign of terror. With what high-handed violence the new ordinances were carried out, we can learn from Layton's letters to his master. Duns Scotus was the object of special ill-treatment. His books were torn up and scattered about with every circumstance of ignominy. This was practically the banishment of sound logic from the English universities, remarks Zimmermann caustically, and so things have remained till quite recent times. Legh proceeded with somewhat more moderation in Cambridge.

No wonder that these measures, and the general uncertainty which prevailed, rapidly tended to diminish the number of students. But the severest blow which the universities received was in the suppression of the great monasteries between 1536-9. Dr. Loudon was commissioned to suppress the nine colleges of the regular orders: Benedictines, Cistercians,

Augustinians, Franciscans, and Dominicans, in Oxford. Nobles, townsfolk, and heads of secular colleges threw themselves greedily upon the plunder; the subjects were bettering the unworthy example of their sovereign. The few regular colleges at Cambridge had the better fate. But the effects of the suppression of the monasteries were more far-reaching. Among these was the destruction of so many of the middle schools which had served as feeders for the universities by affording training for talented boys of the poorer classes. Now began that gradual change which eventually led to the practical shutting out of the poorer classes—who before this epoch had been in the *majority* at the universities—and the exclusive reservation of these national institutions to the rich and the nobles. A little later than this, as Mr. Gladstone reminds us, “Ascham says that among the prevailing evils, there was none more grave than the large admission of the sons of rich men, indifferent to solid and far-reaching study.”* But this was the process which now began, and went steadily on for three centuries.

On Crumwell’s fall, in 1540, Bishop Gardiner succeeded as Chancellor. It is not our business here to discuss the somewhat ambiguous character of Stephen Gardiner. As bishop, he appears to have shown a less pliant disposition than Henry had expected from his former behaviour. He was at any rate a scholar of some merit. During his chancellorship occurred his famous quarrel with the gifted Hellenist, John Cheke, concerning the pronunciation of Greek, which led to a strife as bitter as (to us) it is amusing. Here we meet with the first beginnings of the “pedantry,” which for some time was to cling to English learning. The chancellorship of Gardiner, however, to some extent appears as a time of comparative prosperity to the university. The new regulations published in 1544 were wise and useful. The foundation of Magdalen College, although the complete carrying out of the original plan was not possible till Mary’s reign (1584), falls in this time; and, at length, also Henry’s own long promised foundation, Trinity, Cambridge. In spite of all the misery and uncertainty of the times, there was still a certain number of

* “Romanes Lecture,” p. 23.

scholars of note at the universities, but of these the majority were true to the Old Faith.

At the death of Henry VIII. the country was in a state of the greatest anarchy that it had seen since the Conquest. Never had there been such a severing of classes and such divisions of men's minds. The people were in a temper of despair, and but for the paid army at the King's command, a revolution would probably have broken out. The short reign of the boy-king, Edward VI., was to mark the victory of Protestantism, a victory which, in spite of the temporary Catholic reaction under Mary, was to be continued and consolidated under Elizabeth. The Protector Somerset was a convinced Calvinist; Warwick, later Duke of Northumberland, though at heart a Catholic, relied for the success of his schemes on the Protestant party, as the Catholics naturally favoured Mary.

From the intellectual point of view, the Protestants at this time were decidedly weak, especially in theologians. Cranmer and his friends could not help feeling that they had no men at the universities who could be considered a match for scholars like Dr. Richard Smith, Mallet, or Chedsey at Oxford, Young and Bullock at Cambridge. As Mr. Gladstone points out, "a proof of this relative weakness is supplied by the single fact that to reform our service-books, and to instruct our candidates for holy orders, we were driven to invoke the aid of foreigners." * Already in Henry's lifetime unsuccessful overtures had been made to Melancthon, and now Bucer and Fagius were imported to Cambridge, and Peter Martyr (whose name was Vermigli) to Oxford.

In 1548 and 1549, a new Commission of Visitation was issued for both universities. The statutes, under the sanction of all kinds of penalties, fines, imprisonment, &c., were to effect a thorough revolution in the Protestant sense. The old doctrine was to be extirpated, foundations for masses to be commuted, the forms of divine service to be altered. Some changes were introduced into the prescribed courses of study, and efforts made, not indeed with success, to encourage the study of civil law. Further confusion was a necessary result.

* "Romanes Lecture," p. 25.

Peter Martyr began his lectures at Oxford in 1549. He was the first in England to deny the Real Presence. His crude Zwinglian teaching regarding the Holy Eucharist disgusted the Catholics. Quarrels and even physical strife were the result. Shocking scenes of profanity and desecration occurred in some of the college chapels, especially Magdalen. At Cambridge Dr. Cox was the bitterest enemy of the Catholics. He displayed a literal fury in the wholesale destruction of books and MSS. A new feature in the strife was the introduction of public disputations between the parties. Dr. Richard Smith challenged Peter Martyr to such a trial of skill, but his crafty adversary eluded every attempt to make him face so able a disputant with quite an amusing variety of subterfuges. The end was that Smith, like so many other of Oxford's ablest men, was forced to seek refuge in flight to the Continent. Other Catholics, however, Tresham and Chedsey, took up the cudgels in his place, and Peter Martyr, forced at last to a disputation, cut such a sorry figure that Dr. Cox after four days adjourned the meeting *sine die*. Bucer, also at Cambridge had to face the challenge of Young, Sedgwick, and Andrew, and came off with little credit in a public disputation on theology. Other such intellectual contests followed.

Somerset and Northumberland were meanwhile gradually getting rid of the Catholic professors and officials, whilst Catholic parents (who were still in the majority) were withdrawing their sons from the national universities, to have them educated privately at home or at foreign seats of learning. The lecture-rooms were steadily emptying, and the diminishing ranks of students were recruited only from the sons of the richer classes, whose chief aim was pleasure, not study. We have Latimer's and Lever's lamentations to bear out these statements.* Huber † is therefore fully justified in maintaining that the "Reformation" had injured the universities, both externally and internally. But we cannot agree with him in comparing the reign of Henry VIII. with that of Edward VI., to the advantage of the former. Although the evils grew under the latter reign, it was precisely Henry's policy which

* Letters quoted by Zimmermann pp. 80, 81.

† "English Universities," vol. i. p. 284.

was responsible for them in their origin. Yet even Edward does not seem to have merited all the praise which has been bestowed on him as a patron of learning. The funds for the schools of which he is reckoned the founder were for the most part derived either from Church property or the contributions of the local burgesses.

In the statutes of Trinity College, Cambridge, published by the Visitors at this time, we find first fully developed the systematic plan of making the colleges independent of the university, an innovation which had serious consequences later on, as we shall see. The President is also to take an oath to maintain the Protestant doctrine, and the fellows are to be obliged to abjure the Old Faith, whilst the scholars are to take an oath recognising the Bible as the sole rule of Faith. We are already in the full swing of those penal regulations which long kept the doors of the universities locked against Catholics from the inside.

From 1553 to 1558, the reign of Mary was marked by the short-lived Catholic reaction. The circumstances of her early life, the fanaticism of her religious opponents, the personal affronts she had had to endure under Edward's reign, and the violence of the innovators even after her accession, must go a long way to account for the bitterness and intolerance she displayed herself when in power. At least the universities flourished under her reign. She stands out favourably from the other Tudors in her patronage of learning, and in her personal munificence to the universities. Two zealous Catholics, Sir Thomas Pope and Sir Thomas White, founded at this time the two Oxford colleges of Trinity and St. John's respectively; whilst the Queen's physician, the celebrated Dr. Caius, also an earnest Catholic, by remodelling Gonville Hall, Cambridge, merited the title of the founder of Gonville and Caius, now known by his own name alone. The statutes display broad-minded zeal for the promotion of the study of medicine, for which foundations are provided to be enjoyed at Padua, Bologna, Montpellier, or Paris. The careful disciplinary regulations show us how far the moral tone had descended already at the universities. The keeping of horses and dogs, as well as bull-baiting and bear-baiting, have to be prohibited to the students. In spite of Mullinger's contrary opinion, based

upon such partial witnesses as Ascham, Jewell, and Peter Martyr, Oxford under Mary compares very favourably with Cambridge. The number of students increased—a good sign of prosperity. The B.A.s who graduated during the reign at Oxford were 216, as against 176 at Cambridge.

At the latter university, Gardiner was reinstated as Chancellor, and we cannot but regret that his reversal of all that had taken place under Edward was carried out with much of the same spirit in which it had been introduced. Some of the Protestant party, like Perne, Cheke, and Cecil, yielded and became Catholics. Others were driven out. Those were not days of toleration on either side! * At the same time, we may remark that 125 M.A.s and 195 B.A.s graduated during five years of Mary, as against 90 and 167 respectively during five years of her predecessor. Gardiner died in 1555, and Cardinal Pole succeeded him as Chancellor. Visitors were now sent to both universities for the “extirpation of heresy,” but their new statutes were never carried out, for the Queen’s death followed immediately. Whatever views may be held of her policy, it must at least be said that she did more for the universities than either her predecessor or her successor.

Over the reign of Elizabeth we may pass more rapidly. It was the period not only of the final triumph of Protestantism, but of the remodelling of Protestantism into the form of Anglicanism, and the consequent beginning of the long struggle between that form and Puritanism. Elizabeth herself cannot be said to have had strong religious convictions, and, like Cecil, who could easily change his religion, was influenced rather by political, or, we may say, national, motives.† Her endeavour all along was to found a kind of middle party, a species of Protestantism amalgamated with Catholic discipline. This was “Anglicanism.” As usual, a visitation of the universities was carried out, with the inevitable new regulations and the usual serious interference with the rights and liberties

* “It was not only Mary who thought that heretics should be burnt; John Rogers, who was the first to suffer, had, in the days of Edward, pleaded for the death of Joan Bocher” (S. R. Gardiner, “Student’s History of England,” vol. ii. p. 424).

† “She cared nothing for theology, though her inclinations drew her to a more elaborate ritual than that which the Protestants had to offer. She was, however, intensely national. . . . For this end she must establish national unity in the Church” (S. R. Gardiner, p. 428).

of the ancient "republic of letters," which would never have been tolerated in the Middle Ages. The Catholics showed great steadfastness, and nearly all the heads of colleges and many of the fellows at Oxford either resigned or suffered expulsion. The new men put into their places were mostly very inferior. The test oath, and the system of espionage and persecution which followed it, found some indeed not quite so staunch, and these few formed the kernel of the new "Anglican" party. But the new doctrines had seriously lowered the general estimation of the ecclesiastical character, and both the clergy and the universities sank under Elizabeth into a pitiful condition. "Sunt mutæ musæ nostraque fama fames," was the all-too true complaint of the state of things at Oxford. As to the ignorance of the clergy, we have the emphatic testimony of Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, and of Cecil.* The former in 1561 reported that the heads of colleges were so bad that he could not say whether their absence or their presence were more harmful, for that none of them did any good; whilst "his heart bled" when he thought of St. John's College. Next year Cecil wished to resign the chancellorship, out of disgust at the state of things, for the heads had no care to second him in either controlling disorderly youth, enforcing discipline, or encouraging science and godliness. Probably with the design of improving the state of things at the universities, Elizabeth paid her famous State visits to Cambridge in 1564 and to Oxford in 1566. As a matter of fact, these sumptuous pageants did vastly more harm than good. They tended to encourage the taste for luxury and frivolous amusement, and especially to develop a love for dramatic entertainments, which, whilst directly beneficial to the rise of the English drama, was certainly ill-calculated to improve study or academic discipline.

In 1572 the celebrated Dr. Caius, who for a time had been inclined, with some others, to favour the new "via media" of Anglicanism, and had so kept his place, became a victim of persecution. His college was broken into (by the Vice-Chancellor and Dr. Whitgift, the future Archbishop) and all his vestments, sacred vessels, statues, and other objects cast

* Zimmermann, pp. 96, 97.

into the flames. He did not long survive the blow, dying in London, after a life spent in doing more for the promotion of study at his university than any one of his contemporaries.

In spite of all, there was still considerable vitality in the Catholic party, at least at Oxford. Merton and Corpus had already shown considerable pluck in defending their privileges against Leicester in 1564. There was even a certain Catholic reaction set in :

It would be interesting [says Zimmermann] to show in detail how many professors and students at both universities, little by little, returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church ; how, in very many instances, the reading of Catholic writings converted zealous Protestants and timid Catholics ; with what zeal Catholic booksellers or private persons strove to disseminate Catholic tracts of devotion or controversy among the students ; how often Protestant bishops or heads of houses caused domiciliary visitations to be made, destroyed Catholic books, or severely punished Catholic booksellers and colporteurs.*

One of the best known of these latter cases was that of Rowland Jenks. In 1592 the heads of houses at Cambridge established a commission to prosecute Catholics for "seducing the young," complaining that no books were so widely circulated as Catholic ones, and that in many of the rooms of Anglican professors the majority of the books found were those of scholastic theologians, writings of Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits. Indeed, Anglicanism was no more able to produce a scientific school of theology then than it has been ever since. And there can be little doubt that, if the contest had been fought out with intellectual weapons only, the Catholic party would have come off easily victorious. Mr. Gladstone admits that "the very ablest men among those [Oxford] reared, such as Allen, Campion, Stapleton, and the rest, were ejected and suppressed." †

It is hardly cognate to our purpose to follow Fr. Zimmermann in his history of the struggle between Anglicanism and Puritanism. "Nonconformity," indeed, took its rise at Cambridge, as Mr. Gladstone points out. ‡ Browne and Cartwright, the leaders of the movement, were Cambridge men of note. The latter's election as Professor in 1569 and subsequent exclu-

* Pp. 100, 101.

† "Romanes Lecture," p. 25.

‡ *Ibid.*

sion by the Vice-Chancellor Mey led to a serious storm; the situation became so critical that a fresh revision of the statutes was decided upon. It was John Whitgift who was charged with this revision. This remarkable man seems originally to have been a Calvinist, but his skilful trimming made him a valued ally of the Queen. It is well known to what importance he eventually rose as Archbishop of Canterbury. Indeed, Fr. Zimmermann does not hesitate to declare that to him and Elizabeth is owing the foundation of the Anglican High Church system, and that Laud (to whom, by the way, Mr. Gladstone assigns so high a position as a Churchman*) merely followed in their footsteps. Whitgift's new statutes transferred the centre of gravity of university authority. The heads of colleges formed a new body of very great power, into whose hands almost all practical control was transferred. This also had much effect upon subsequent developments. Little by little the universities were becoming mere seminaries for Anglican divines. Yet, although Cartwright had to fly to Geneva, the Anglican bishops were in an awkward position, and did not dare to proceed to extremities against the Puritans, as against the Catholics. There is a curious memorial of complaint from them about the state of things at the universities, chiefly interesting to us as it incidentally refers to civil law and natural science as "useless branches of study!" The fact is, the universities were once more in a state of intellectual decline, of which we have contemporary testimony in Traver's "*Ecclesiasticæ Disciplinæ Explicatio*" (1574). Most of the best men fled abroad. So in 1583 some eighty professors and students followed Dr. Allen to Rheims, and most of these were from Oxford. Leicester's influence at Oxford as Chancellor was for evil. Though the number of students increased under his rule, good discipline and study rapidly declined, and Oxford was soon outstripped by Cambridge. The centre of intellectual life had meanwhile been transferred to London.

To sum up the results of the Reformation in the universities. The independence and rights of the national seats of learning had come to an end with freedom of research and opinion. The authority of the Senate had been superseded by that of the

* "*Romanes Lecture*," pp. 37-39.

heads of houses, as we have seen, and these colleges were merely seminaries for training Anglican clergymen. The students were made up of two classes: the sons of the nobility, idlers, and pleasure-seekers on the one hand, and Protestant divines, to whom theology was merely a "bread-study" leading to prospective benefices. The best class—the poorer middle class—had disappeared. The real talent of the universities was to be sought abroad, in the flourishing colleges founded by Allen, or after his example; especially at Douay, which at the time far surpassed Oxford. The study of law and medicine had almost disappeared, and the professors could get no hearers. In seven years Oxford could produce but one doctor and eight bachelors in law. The natural sciences and mathematics were treated with the utmost contempt, as dishonourable for university students! * Greek was almost forgotten. During the last forty years of the century Mullinger admits that only two men at Cambridge certainly knew Greek, and perhaps three others had a smattering of it. Things were worse at Oxford. Latin, too, was far less known at the close than at the beginning of the century. Hebrew, owing to the importance now attached to the text of Scripture, had received some more attention; but the most distinguished Orientalist at Oxford, Robert Wakefield,† had been a Catholic; and his brother Thomas, who also remained true to the faith, was the first public professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, where, however, Protestant bigotry forbade his lecturing. Foreigners or Jews were the chief teachers of Hebrew after them. Rhetoric had taken the place of solid learning. History has only the name of Camden (Oxford) to show; Leland, the antiquarian, had been suffered to die in neglect and poverty. In a word, learning had not gained in a single branch by the Reformation. And no attempt at improvement was made till the reigns of the Stuarts.

College life and discipline had fared no better. An entire change had come over society. The rural population, flocking to the towns, had become spoilt and corrupted.‡ The character of the bishops, clergy, and heads of colleges had descended

* See the quotations and examples, Zimmermann, p. 122.

† He became the first professor of Hebrew at Louvain. He had, however, supported the royal divorce and shared in the plundering of the monasteries (Nève).

‡ Hall, "Society in the Elizabethan Age" (1887), pp. 104, 105.

both intellectually and morally. The abuses of the collegiate system, of university "graces," and of the tutorial system had most serious results upon the universities. The students came up much too young—lads of twelve or thirteen, Peacham tells us—and were badly prepared. The heads of colleges abused their autocratic powers. The material prosperity of the colleges (greatly augmented by Sir Thomas Smith's wise regulations) was accompanied by general intellectual stagnation. Poorer students, sizars, were systematically degraded into the position of drudges. How different from the state of things in the Middle Ages!

What the Reformation meant for the entire nation, was also what it meant for the universities; the robbery of the poor, the enrichment of the great, the almost absolute exclusion of talent and industry from place and honour. A brilliant university career had formerly opened a path to high office in Church and State; this was now reserved for a privileged class. Formerly the university professor was able, by one or more livings, which laid upon him no obligation of residence, to secure an existence free from anxiety; now the stipend of a professor was far too little. Formerly, by the study of philosophy, by public disputations and other scholastic exercises, not only the memory, but also the thinking powers had been developed; now study was directed almost exclusively to cramming the memory. Formerly there was freedom of research, so far as it did not run counter to the dogmas of the Catholic Church; now the narrowest compulsory teaching prevailed. Formerly ideal ends were united with science; now science was esteemed only so far as it served practical ends. From the continental universities nothing had been borrowed but unrestrained polemics and party passion. The warning of Bacon* and others fell on deaf ears. Not till the beginning of the present century were some of the crying abuses which had crept in during the sixteenth century, done away with, and the universities brought nearer to their true end and object.†

It is not without significance that the vast reforms in the national universities which had signalled the latter half of this nineteenth century, have all been in the direction of the state of things in pre-reformation times. There has been a casting down of barriers; first religious, by the abolition of test-oaths; then social, by the gradual re-admission of the middle and poorer classes. The tendency nowadays to build a procession of bridges from the primary school, across the middle school

* Works, ed. Spedding, vol. iii. pp. 326-328, 597.

† Zimmermann, p. 138.

and grammar school, up to the university itself, is merely a reversion to what existed on a much larger scale in Catholic times. Even for the poor boy, gifted by talent and industry, there is now ever-increasing opportunity for rising to an academic career, but as yet to a far less extent than there was in the Middle Ages. The intellectual revival in every department has been extraordinary indeed; here again we are going back to the Oxford and Cambridge of Old England. During the last twenty years, we are assured by unquestionable authority, the growth of earnestness and the spirit of work, the decline of luxury and frivolity, the greater simplicity of student life have made the Oxford and Cambridge of 1895 something very unlike that of even the seventies. Here again we have a reversion to the thirteenth and two subsequent centuries. This being so, it appears providentially timed that a beginning should be made of once more opening the road towards those old Catholic foundations, the national universities, for the spiritual and intellectual heirs of their founders, who have been exiled from them for three hundred years. But the restoration will scarce be complete till we can see the successes of St. Edmund Rich, of Stapleton, and of Allen—and, may we hope, those of Kilwardby, Roger Bacon, and Duns Scotus—pursuing the same paths of study, divine as well as human, by the banks of the Isis and the Cam.

L. C. CASARTELLI.

Science Notices.

The Scientific Work of Professor Huxley.—A leading weekly journal has described the pure scientific work of the late Professor Huxley as the accident of his career, giving him pre-eminence as the founder of a school of thought. The writer has surely confounded notoriety with fame. While Huxley attained the former by certain speculations he chose to evolve from his researches, his fame in the future will rest upon his brilliant biological investigations.

For these has Huxley received his meed of honours, and it is only the consideration of his pure scientific work that falls within the scope of these notices.

The first revelation of his extraordinary powers of observation was the brief note which, while a medical student at Charing Cross Hospital, he contributed to the *Medical Times and Gazette* concerning that layer in the root-sheath of hair which has since been called Huxley's layer. It was, however, his original investigation of the fauna of the Southern Seas, carried on while he was assistant surgeon on board the *Rattlesnake* from 1846-50, that gained him fame as a naturalist. During the course of its voyage the vessel traversed many parts of tropical oceans, including the coasts of Australia, little investigated by the zoologist. Thus he had ample opportunities of observing the lower pelagic animals in the living state, and during the voyage sent home several communications to the Royal Society of sufficient value to ensure his election as Fellow of the Society shortly after his arrival in England.

In 1874 Dr. Ernst Haeckel wrote a notice of Huxley's principal biological discoveries in *Nature*. This account has been much drawn upon in the Huxley literature that has lately appeared. It contains, however, an able estimate of the value of his scientific work; and it has been referred to for the following facts:

Dr. Haeckel, without hesitation, places Huxley at the head of the zoologists of this country. In each of the large divisions of the animal kingdom he made important discoveries. As has been stated, his early labours were occupied with the lower marine animals, especially with the pelagic organisms swimming at the surface of the sea.

In the Protozoa he first elucidated the mysterious Thalassicollidæ and Sphærozoida. In his work on "Oceanic Hydrozoa" he has increased our knowledge of zoophytes. In the paper he communicated to the Royal Society in 1849 he pointed out that the bodies of these animals are constructed of two cell layers—of the Ectoderm and the Endoderm—and that these, physiologically and morphologically, may be compared to the two germinal layers of higher animals. He first showed the affinities of Echinodermata with Vermes, demolishing the old view that the Echinodermata belong to the Radiata, and, on account of their radial type, should be classed with corals, medusæ, &c. He pointed out that the whole organisation of the former is different from the latter, and that the Echinodermata are more nearly related morphologically to worms.

He also threw much light on the important group of Tunicata by his studies of Ascidians, Appendicularia, Pyrosoma, Doliolum, and Salpa. He has made us more intimate with the morphology of the Mollusca and Arthropoda; and he considered the generation of vine fretters from a new point of view.

He specially advanced the comparative anatomy and classification of the Vertebrata, and expounded his researches in his "Lectures on the Elements of Comparative Anatomy," and in other separate publications dealing with living and extinct fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals.

The Mitigation of the Fading of Pigments.—In the Parliamentary Report made in 1888 by Captain Abney and Dr. Russell on the fading of pigments in pictures, it was stated that every pigment is permanent when exposed to light in vacua, also that the rays which produce the greatest changes in pigments are the blue and the violet components of white light. To provide a vacuum casing for pictures would certainly be no easy task, though experiments have been made in this direction by a Company. Captain Abney has not chosen the preventive method for his experiments, but has confined his efforts to one which minimises the deteriorating influence by controlling the kind of light admitted to the pigments. The results of his experiments can now be witnessed in the Raffaele Cartoon Gallery. The method consists in subtracting the active violet rays from the light admitted to the gallery.

The glazing of the roof is in alternate strips of blue-green and yellow glass. The mixture of rays that pass into the gallery produces a white light devoid of the violet rays, since they are stopped by the blue green and the yellow glass. The hues of the pigment do

not suffer from the exclusion of the violet rays, for it has been shown that these are practically useless for giving illumination, the yellow rays having about two hundred times the illumination of the strongest violet ray.

Captain Abney has measured the amount of luminosity lost by the new method :

I place the yellow glass in one white beam, and alongside it send another beam of white light. By intervening a rod in the paths of the two beams, to cast two shadows, and reducing one by rotating sectors which can give a larger or smaller aperture at will during rotation, we can arrive at a point where the two shadows are equally luminous. Removing the glass the balance is again secured, and we find that in this case the aperture required is 60° , and in the other 85° , showing that the yellow glass allows $\frac{3}{7}$ of the white light to pass through it. We can do the same with the blue-green glass, and find it cuts off a deal more, allowing only $\frac{1}{6}$ of the light to pass. Now, if half the roof be glazed with yellow glass and the other half with the blue-green glass, the total light passing through is only 45 per cent. of what would fall through the aperture of the roof if no glass were in it. Absorption and reflection by white glass reduce that loss to about 50 per cent.

This loss is considerable, but it can be compensated, by increasing the area of the glazed portion of the roof. This has been done in the Raffaele Cartoon Gallery.

The diminution of chemical activity by the removal of the violet rays has been proved by taking a photograph in the Raffaele gallery and in the adjoining one, lit in the ordinary manner. A bromide plate requires nearly ten times the exposure in the former to what it does in the latter.

To estimate the extension of the period for fading gained by the new method of lighting is a matter for time alone to decide. "Putting it as low as ten times, we have a considerable saving. Thus, a picture which in ordinary light would last ten years, will, if hung in this light, last at least one hundred years, and probably two hundred years."

Captain Abney has suggested that private houses might with advantage be illuminated with such a light as has been described. Not only would it tend to preserve the pictorial heirlooms, but it would have a beneficial effect on the eyesight, as the ultra-violet rays are supposed to excite the fluorescent properties of the retina and produce irritability.

But Captain Abney perhaps forgets that recent experiments have proved the hygienic value of the violet rays. Since they are the microbe destroyers, the advantage in excluding them from our dwelling places is a very doubtful one.

M. Andrée's Proposed Balloon Voyage to the North Pole.—At the recent Geographical Congress, M. Andrée unfolded his daring scheme for reaching the North Pole in a balloon. It cannot be said to have been met with enthusiasm, but rather with criticism. The President of the Congress was of opinion that the plan should not be encouraged, and by one member at least it was denounced as foolhardy. In spite of adverse opinion, M. Andrée adheres to his intention, and certainly his voyage will command the keen attention of all those who are interested in balloon navigation.

M. Andrée is a Swedish engineer. His own countrymen appear to be more sympathetic than foreigners, for they subscribed the necessary funds within fourteen days. M. Andrée is an aeronaut of experience and courage, having once made a balloon voyage from Gothenburg to the Isle of Gothland, during which he crossed part of the Baltic. He has also had experience of Polar regions. He proposes to use a balloon large enough to carry three persons, and being provided with a double outer covering. It is to be furnished with provisions for four months. The car will be fitted with meteorological instruments, life buoys, and collapsible boats. It will be provided with means of instantly detaching it from the balloon. M. Andrée is endeavouring to obtain an absolutely impermeable covering for the balloon. If he succeeds in finding this he will receive the gratitude of all aeronauts. He places much confidence in the use of guy ropes, which he will allow to drag on the ground. He also intends to fix a sail on to the balloon, maintaining that the combination of sail and guy ropes will enable him to steer the balloon to some extent. The start is to be made from Spitzbergen in July next. M. Andrée estimates that the journey to the Pole will take forty-three hours. It is doubtful whether he will return at that speed.

Electric Strokes and their Treatment.—According to M. D'Arsonval, the deaths of persons who have been subjected to severe electric shocks is due to two different causes: (1) The damage or destruction of the tissues; (2) The over-excitation of the nervous centres, arresting respiration. In this second case the victim of the stroke is merely in a swoon resembling some one who has been semi-drowned, and if treated in the right manner can be resuscitated. The apparent deaths of this class seem to be produced by alternating currents. Since alternating currents have been used in the United States to execute criminals, the authorities possibly have

now to face the startling fact that they have been burying their victims alive. Conclusive experiments have been tried with animals, but recently an accident happened to a man, at St. Denis, which confirms M. D'Arsonval's theories. The man was employed at St. Denis in fixing a telephone wire alongside of some wires conveying a current of 4500 volts. The wires were held in position by small posts fixed to a wall by cramping irons. He was sitting astride upon the bar of the lower cramping iron, foolishly holding one of the conducting wires with one hand. The telephone wire which he had taken up with him was resting on the cramping iron, and it accidentally touched the conducting wire. There was a short circuit through the body of the man, the current entering by one hand and passing out by his thigh. How long the current was thus short-circuited is not exactly known, but it was certainly for some minutes. The superintendent in charge of the apparatus at Epinay, owing to the sparking of the terminals, suspected that there was a short circuit somewhere on the line, and telephoned for the machinery to be stopped. About a quarter of an hour afterwards, Messieurs Picon and Leblanc, two well-known electricians, arrived at St. Denis and found the man still sitting in the same position and apparently dead. Immediately after taking him down, which took about half an hour, they went through the usual process of producing artificial respiration by raising the arms, opening the mouth, &c. After some little time the patient began to breathe, and in two hours was able to speak. He appears to have felt no further evil effects from his accident excepting two burns, one on his hand and the other on his thigh.

Possibly the same treatment might be successful in cases when persons are struck by lightning.

The Electromotive Force of Starlight—Photo-Electric Cells.

—In a recent number of *Nature* Professor Minders describes the photo-electric cell by means of which he has, in conjunction with Professor Fitzgerald and Mr. W. E. Wilson, measured the electromotive force of the light of some of the planets and stars.

The method for pursuing this fascinating research was first devised a little more than a year ago in Mr. Wilson's observatory at Daramona, Westmeath.

The original photo-electric cell was constructed with selenium, aluminium, and the liquid *œnanthol*. The way in which the cell was formed was as follows :

A strip of clean aluminium, about half an inch long and one tenth of an inch wide, was laid on an iron plate, which was heated by a Bunsen flame. On the end of the strip was placed a small particle of selenium, which melted and formed a small black globule of liquid. The flame was then taken away and the melted selenium spread over the end of the aluminum strip by a glass rod, so that it formed a thin uniform layer, about $\cdot 1$ of an inch square, on the end of the strip. The dark layer was allowed to cool to a few degrees below its melting-point, which was about 217° C. Then the under surface of the iron plate was again heated, until the layer of selenium was nearly remelted. During the process the colour of the layer changed from black to a greyish brown. When it was just on the point of melting the heat was withdrawn, and the surface of the selenium cooled by being blown upon. This left the surface of the selenium in a state in which it is very sensitive to light. The end of the strip covered with selenium was immersed in a glass tube containing *cenanthol*, and connected with one pole of a quadrant electrometer, whose other pole was connected to a platinum wire sealed into the glass tube. This arrangement constituted the cell, in which the action of light falling upon the selenium layer gives the selenium a positive electric charge and the liquid a negative one, the positive charge being conveyed to one pole of the electrometer by the plate and the negative charge to the other pole by the platinum wire sealed into the cell.

It is stated that ordinary diffused daylight will produce in such a cell as this an electromotive force of between one-third and one-half of a volt.

The electromotive force of the light of some of the planets and stars, including that of *Sirius*, was measured by means of this cell; but it has been found that it is not constant, and it is therefore unreliable. The strip of aluminium at the same time conveys to the insulated pole of the electrometer the positive charge produced by light in the selenium, and part of the negative charge imparted to the liquid, with the result that the electromotive force is less than it should be. Again, there are currents circulating between the selenium and the back of the strip of aluminium which tend to deteriorate the cell. In practice it is found that the strength of such cells falls off after about six hours.

An improved cell has now been devised, with which excellent work has been done.

The strip of aluminium is replaced by a wire of the same metal, about one millimetre in diameter, at the end of which the selenium is deposited. The wire is enclosed in a glass tube, in which it fits

tightly, the end of the wire on which there is the selenium layer being flush with the end of the tube. The other end of the aluminium wire is connected with a fine platinum wire, which emerges from the other end of the glass tube and forms the selenium pole of the photo-electric cell. The glass tube containing the wire fits into a cork which closes the side of the glass cell containing the liquid. The extremity of the tube at which is the selenium-coated aluminium wire fits close up against a quartz window, inserted in the cell just opposite the cork. A platinum wire is sealed into the bottom of the glass cell, and conveys the charge taken by the liquid to one pole of the electrometer. In this cell, the liquid being kept out of contact with the wire, the local currents are avoided. The cell has remained constant for three months.

The light of the planets and stars to be measured is received through a telescope on the quartz window, so that it falls on the selenium layer. It is important that the light of the star should cover the whole of the sensitive layer. With this cell the electromotive forces of the lights of Jupiter, Saturn, Vega, Arcturus, Regulus, Procyon and other stars have been measured. So sensitive is this cell to light that if a paraffin candle is held at a distance of 9 ft. from the quartz window of the cell, it produces an electromotive force of about 0.3 volts. The light of Arcturus gave 0.82 of the electromotive force produced by the candle at 7 ft., the light of Saturn and Regulus 0.56.

It is found that the cell is most sensitive to the yellow rays, though it responds to all rays of the spectrum, and even to rays considerably below the visible red and blue.

The Spontaneous Combustion of Hay.—For a long time it has been supposed that the spontaneous combustion of hay is caused by the joint action of oxidation and decomposition. The particular process, however, which so often leads to the loss of large quantities of hay, has not, until lately, been very clearly elucidated.

We are indebted to Messieurs Berthelot and André for the explanation of the phenomenon. The process is not so simple as has been thought to be the case. After hay has been dried to a certain extent fermentation sets in, which is accompanied by considerable heat. The heating increases until the temperature is reached which destroys the microbes. The temperature, however, does not always fall with the death of the agents which produced it, for the high temperature

favours oxidation, which, when set up, re-acts on the temperature, which may rise high enough to effect spontaneous combustion. There are, therefore, two separate stages in the process: (1) The fermentation stage, which affords the necessary temperature for oxidation; (2) The purely chemical stage, which is directly responsible for the spontaneous combustion.

Notes of Travel and Exploration.

The American North-West.—Mr. Somerset's* experiences in a region which seems to be one of the most forbidding on the earth's surface are not calculated to invite others to follow in his track. The muskegs, from which the book takes its title, are treacherous morasses covered with green spongy moss alternating with pools of water. The country traversed in the basins of the Athabasca and Peace Rivers was covered to a great extent by these swamps, varied with forest so dense that a path had to be cut through it with the axe. It rained almost every day, and as the bush was wet even when the sky was clear, the travellers were perpetually soaked from head to foot. For many days they walked ankle-deep in swamp or muskeg, and sometimes for hours at a time in water reaching to above the knee. Waterproof sheets were unavailing to keep out the universal deluge, and often by reaching out of bed they could plunge their hands to the wrist, or even to the elbow, in slushy water or sodden mud. Add to this the plague of mosquitoes, which swarm in such multitudes that the moose and deer of the country often die from loss of blood caused by their bites and those of the bull-dog flies. The mode of travel for greater part of the distance was on foot, with horses as baggage carriers. Little game was shot, and the rifles of the party failed to supply sufficient food, so that one of the horses had to be slaughtered to reinforce the commissariat. Even this resource proved inadequate, and they were reduced to the last extremity of hunger, having been two days almost without food, before reaching the Hudson's Bay Station in British Columbia, whence they were able to descend the Fraser River and its tributaries, and so strike the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Indians in this region depend largely on rabbits for their food, and as these for some mysterious reason die out or disappear every seven years, the mortality among the tribes increases at the same periods.

* "The Land of the Muskeg." By H. Somers Somerset. London: Heinemann. 1895.

General Character of the Athabasca Region.—The country beyond the Edmonton district in Alberta and the fertile plains of the Saskatchewan is declared to be totally unfitted for agricultural settlement, and the vast territory from the Athabasca to the Barren Grounds and thence to the Arctic Ocean, to the north of the 54th parallel, is condemned as worthless for colonisation. The Athabasca Landing, 100 miles north of Edmonton, is the last outpost of the Canadian Government, and the country north of that river, though nominally included in the Dominion, is not practically subject to any constituted authority. No treaties have been made with the Indians, as throughout the remainder of Canada, and it is at least an open question whether the jurisdiction of the Canadian courts extends beyond the river. The only form of authority recognised in practice is that exercised by the Hudson Bay's Company's officer and the Catholic missionaries:

These last [says Mr. Pollen, who has written the preface of the book] fill a picturesque place in the story of the country. At almost every fort you will find the neat log-houses and church of the Roman Catholic Mission, and the priests themselves are all highly educated men, while most of them are of good French or French-Canadian families. Their influence with the Indians is immense. During the last rebellion the Canadian Government owed much to the missionaries' power of restraining incipient revolt, and every Hudson's Bay Company's officer we met was loud and unqualified in their praise. This would hardly be so were not their services to civilisation and good order known beyond dispute, for the officers in question were to a man alien to their race and their creed, and, as we had lamentable occasion to remark, the bitterness of religious differences is not a whit softer in that country than in ours. For ourselves, we have a score of services to thank them for, and the fathers at the Little Slave Lake, Smoky River, Dunvegan, and Fort M'Leod, placed themselves and all they possessed at our disposal in the friendliest way.

Père Morice, encountered at Stewart's Lake, in British Columbia, was especially helpful, as his influence with the Indians was prodigious. It was a surprise to the travellers to find a *savant* and a man of letters, who, though a Frenchman, spoke irreproachable English, working among the Indians in a lonely north-western mission. Judging from his congregation, however, his learning does not seem to be thrown away, as they are immeasurably superior to their neighbours.

They build log houses [says the author], and many speak English and read books and a monthly review in the native tongue, printed in the syllabary which their priest has invented for them. This is one of the many extraordinary achievements of this prince of missionaries, who not only is his own editor, compositor, and printer, but has invented a most ingenious syllabary, which is easily learnt; so that Indians who have no idea what writing is, have been known to learn to read and write this language with perfect correctness after two or three days' instruction.

The Antarctic Continent.—One of the most interesting papers read at the Geographical Congress in August was that of Herr Borchgravink, a young Norwegian, who with his companions landed on Cape Adair, and was probably the first human being to set foot on the great continent of the South Pole, conjectured to contain a land mass perhaps twice the size of Europe, and absolutely unknown to science. The explorer was compelled to work his passage before the mast in the whaler *Antarctic* as the only way of reaching his destination, and was consequently unable to make any regular scientific observations. Sailing from Melbourne on September 20, 1894, they saw the Aurora Australis for the first time on October 18, in about 34° S. latitude. It formed a shining ellipse above the horizon with a periodic splendour culminating about once in five minutes and dying out in the intervals. In latitude 58° , on November 6, a great ice-barrier, or chain of barriers, was sighted, extending for forty or fifty miles from east to north-west. With a level top as white as snow it attained a maximum elevation of 600 feet, the sides towering in cliffs of ashen grey channelled with green caves, through which the seas raged and roared, spouting from the summit in fountains of spray. In the beginning of December they reached the great fields of ice entered by Sir James Ross on January 5, 1841, with the *Erebus* and *Terror*. Working their way through the floes, which grew larger as land was approached, the Arctic Circle was just reached on December 24, and the speaker believed they were the only people who ever saw the midnight sun on Christmas Eve. Cape Adair, in Victoria Land, sighted on January 16, consisted of a mass of basalt 3779 feet high, from whose summit was afforded a view of the coast of Victoria Land stretching to the west and south as far as the eye could reach. Its frowning shores rose from bare and barren rocks to peaks of ice 12,000 feet above the sea, Mount Sabine towering above the rest under the level rays of the midnight sun. The lofty cones sent down great streams of ice, and twenty of these glaciers were counted in the immediate vicinity of Cape Adair. The landing of the party was disputed by flocks of penguins, whose hoarse screams expressed their indignation at the presence of the intruders. The accumulated deposits of guano may be a valuable addition to the resources of Australasia. The adventurous traveller recommended regular exploration of the Antarctic continent, and offered to lead a land party either on snow-shoes or with dog-sledges to be landed on the pack or the mainland at Colman Island, whence a journey of 160 miles would bring them to the South Magnetic Pole.

News from the Upper Nile.—The *Times* of August 6 publishes the substance of letters which had just reached England, giving an account of the state of affairs in the countries north of Uganda in the middle of March. Major Cunningham and Lieutenant Vandeleur had been despatched in the previous December to Unyoro, with directions to take over the country and then proceed as far as possible down the Nile in order to report on the situation along that river. They succeeded in bringing their ponies safely to Fort Hoima, the headquarters of the force holding Unyoro, after a journey of thirteen days from Victoria Nyanza, through a country in which the crossing of five or six swamps was the only obstacle to fair travelling. In a steel boat, carrying sixteen men and a Maxim gun, the two officers successfully navigated the Nile as far as Dufle, reached on January 14. They learned that the dervishes were in occupation of Rejaf, from which it seems probable that the Belgian Congo Free State forces, which had taken possession of Lado, must have withdrawn from it, as otherwise the Khalifa's outpost would be cut off from its communications with his headquarters. The rapids below Dufle being found impassable, the party returned to Lake Albert, their progress being much delayed by the strength of the current, especially below Wadelai. The country on both sides of the river seemed arid and barren as seen from the deck of the steamer. During February there was some fighting in Unyoro between Kabarega and a force which had marched north from Uganda. The result of these operations, in which Captain Dunning was fatally and Major Cunningham severely wounded, was that Kabarega was compelled to cross the Somerset Nile and take refuge in the Bakedi country. The column, having achieved its object, returned to Uganda, leaving Major Cunningham at Fort Hoima in Unyoro, with Lieutenant Vandeleur in temporary command. As regards the movements of the Khalifa, it is not thought likely that he will attempt an advance in this direction, although he is evidently anxious about affairs on the Upper Nile, fearing to find himself hemmed in between the British there and the Italians at Kassala.

Swamp Vegetation in British Guiana.—Mr. Rodway, in his volume "*In the Guiana Forest*" (Fisher Unwin, 1894), devotes some interesting pages to a description of the work done by the *courida* (*Avicenna Nitida*), long confounded by old writers with the mangrove, in reclaiming land from the sea. This it does by the agency of its roots, which extend laterally to a great distance in a tangle of inter-

lacing fibres with upward growing shoots, forming a close palisade of woody pegs giving coherency to the mass. This natural fascine collects and stops all the deposit of the streams, until mud and vegetable *débris* become sufficiently compacted together to form new islands, or extensions of the coast-line of the mainland. The mangrove assists in the same work, but in a different way, sending down aerial roots from its branches, which in their turn spring up into fresh trunks. As an instance of the additions thus formed to the continent and its outlying archipelagoes, the author describes the formation within this century of a new headland on the coast of Demerara, known as Courabanna Point. The creek, which originally drained the adjacent land, having been gradually diminished, as its waters were diverted by the sugar plantations established on its banks, had no longer a current sufficiently strong to clear away the mud from its estuary, where it consequently formed a shoal narrowing its outlet to a small channel on either side. On this vantage-ground the floating seeds of courida found a lodgment, and growing into a thicket, extended the dimensions of the island. The latter eventually became united to the mainland as a headland or promontory, completely closing the smaller channel, and leaving the river but a single outlet. In course of time even this became obstructed, and as more plantations caused a still greater diversion of the stream, it finally ceased to exist, and is now completely obliterated. By similar action of vegetation, a sandbank at the mouth of the Essequibo river, marked as such on the charts of the early part of the century, has been converted into an island two miles in length by one in breadth. It owes its name, Dauntless Island, to the immediate cause of its existence, the shipwreck in 1862 of the schooner *Dauntless*, whose spars, projecting through the water, intercepted some of the floating tangle, and thus provided a foothold for the aggressive courida, the most energetic of vegetable invaders, in stretching to an ell the first inch of ground conceded to it.

Railways for West Africa.—The neglect of the British West African colonies has restricted their usefulness to the Empire at large. Although they have been for four hundred years in the possession of the Crown, they remain little more than a selva of beach, in some places extending only half a mile from the coast. The Royal Niger Company, on the other hand, within ten years of its formal constitution, administers an area of half a million square miles, with a population of some twenty-five or twenty-six millions. The amount of the trade of the West Coast is, neverthe-

less, not far short of £7,000,000 per annum, of which three-fourths is transacted with the mother country. The deputation that waited on Mr. Chamberlain on August 25, received satisfactory assurances of the prospects of railway construction to develop the resources of the West Coast, and as regards Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast, the preliminary arrangements are already in a forward state. The latter colony, whose coast-line extends for 350 miles from the French settlement of Grand Bassam to German Togoland, covers with its protectorate about 40,000 square miles, mostly smothered in dense forest, the timber having been cleared only for a short distance from the coast. As there are no good roads, and the rivers are not navigable, all transport has to be effected by native porters. The palm oil trade, consequently, does not extend more than 50 miles from the coast, although the oil palm abounds. The railway intended to render this region accessible, will lead from Apam on the coast to a distance of some 55 miles inland, to a point where several important routes meet, and whence it can eventually be continued to Ashanti. It will thus open up a rich district, with the prospect of extension to the track of the Arab caravans to the interior. The cost of the first section is estimated at £350,000, and in order to cover interest on capital, calculated at £17,500, and working expenses put down as £13,000, a return of £30,500 would be required, which it is calculated a charge of 17s. 2d. on the present amount of traffic would produce. As a saving of over £9 a ton would be effected on the actual rate of carriage, a large increase may be reasonably looked for. The line from Sierra Leone is intended to extend from Freetown towards Bumban, a native town of 2000 inhabitants, the capital of the important district of Limba. The route of 140 miles surveyed passes through a fairly populous country, and strikes some of the tracks of existing trade with the interior. The cost is estimated at £650,000 and interest and working expenses at over £60,000 per annum.

Silver Production at Broken Hill.—Mr. Moreton Frewen, in the September number of the *Contemporary Review*, shows reason for believing that New South Wales possesses in the celebrated Broken Hill mine the greatest silver deposit the world has ever seen. He compares it to Comstock, the great “bonanza” of Nevada, which from the time it was first struck in 1864, produced over a hundred millions sterling of the precious metals, £65,000,000 worth of silver and £35,000,000 of gold. Even this production may, he thinks, be outdone by that of Broken Hill, although it has as yet yielded in

ten years but £15,000,000. The calculation is based on the mass of sulphide ores, estimated at 20,000 tons, already in sight, which probably contain silver, lead, and zinc in sufficient quantity to bring the gross yield up to £150,000,000. The number of miners and smelters employed was 4700, and the production for 1894 was 3,000,000 sterling, or £643 16s. a head. Considering the number of other industries dependent on the camp, its expenditure of £400 a day on timber, of £1,500,000 a year on coal, coke, and limestone, and of £160,000 a year on freight, the writer concludes that its silver "bonanza" alone is worth to the colony nearly as much as its entire agricultural population, which outnumbers that of the camp by 13 to 1. Its future depends, in his estimation, mainly on the solution of what he calls the greatest metallurgical problem of the day—how to effect the cheap separation of silver-lead from zinc so as to save the three metals.

Mining Prospects in British Columbia.—Mr. C. Phillipps-Woolley and Mr. W. C. Prescott write in the *Times* of August 16 and September 4, on the growing development of the mining industry of British Columbia, mostly under the influence of United States capital. Three railways are now competing for the produce of the West Kootenay district, where there were none in 1890, and in 1894-5 24,000 tons of silver-lead ore were shipped thence. A gold bearing belt of ore has been discovered and opened up since last year, and the camp of Rossland, which consisted of four huts in 1894, has now some 2000 inhabitants. The War Eagle mine has, since its purchase last December, paid dividends covering its entire price and all subsequent expenses, while ten times its original price has been offered for it. The Cliff mine and the Northern Star are situated on what is described as "one of the most remarkable fissure veins ever yet discovered in any country." The space of some 300 ft. between its walls is filled up by the Mammoth vein, which has been followed for six miles in a straight line without any appearance of a break. The Slocan Star mine in the silver-lead district is said to give promise of rivalling that of Broken Hill in productiveness. British Columbia has since 1859 contributed 10,000,000 sterling's worth of gold to the common stock, of which the greater part was yielded by the still unexhausted Cariboo mine. The principal mining fields enjoy the advantage of water communication, by the Arrow lakes, Kootenay lake and river, and Columbia river, while deposits of coal in the immediate neighbourhood will facilitate the

working of the railways. A good road thirteen miles in length connects Rossland with the Columbia river, so that access to it is comparatively easy.

Navigation of the Mekong.—An arduous and successful voyage on the Mekong is announced in a telegram of September 5 by the *Times* correspondent in Paris. Lieutenant Simon has performed the feat of carrying a French gunboat as far as Luang Prabang nearly 1500 miles from the sea, as the result of two years' labour. The vessel had indeed to be transported past the rapids of Khong on a short temporary railway, but was navigated up those of Kemerab, sixty miles in length, at the cost of six days of such critical work, as one of the subordinate officers says, no personal consideration would induce him to undergo again. From above Khong to the foot of these rapids the river may serve for trade, except in spring, when it is too shallow, but above Wien-kang the river cannot be regarded as navigable for practical purposes. The expedition may, however, have a considerable effect in diverting the trade of the Laos country from Bangkok to Saigon, as the chiefs repeatedly asked the officers about the comparative cost of sending goods by the two routes.

Notices of Books.

Saint Thomas et Le Prédéterminisme. Par H. GAYRAUD, Ancien Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Toulouse. Paris : P. Lethielleux, Libraire-Éditeur. Rue Cassette. Pp. 137.

HOW our freedom of will is to be reconciled with the science, will, and operation of God is a question which has engaged the attention of theologians since the days of St. Augustine. The heresies concerning the effects of original sin, grace, and predestination which were introduced during the sixteenth century brought the question into still greater prominence; and there arose, in consequence, the two opposite schools of Thomists and Molinists. The Thomists were for some time rather inclined to doubt the orthodoxy of the Molinist position. It seemed to them that the Molinists safeguarded the freedom of the will at the expense of the divine causality. The Molinists were at least equally inclined to doubt the orthodoxy of the Thomist position. It seemed to them that the Thomists safeguarded the divine causality at the expense of the freedom of the will. The decision of the Holy See has long since made this stage of the controversy a matter of mere history. But whether the Thomists or the Molinists are the truer exponents of the mind of St. Thomas remains an open question and is still with sufficient heat debated. Massive volumes like those of Dummermuth, Schneeman, and Frins continue to appear on one side or the other. But now comes forward M. Gayraud to declare, and if possible prove, that St. Thomas was neither a Thomist nor a Molinist. This might strike us as a little temerarious were it not that there have always been theologians who, like Cardinal Pecci and Satolli in our own day, have stood aloof from the contending schools and claimed to base their position on the teaching of St. Thomas. That M. Gayraud has made good his case we are not prepared to say; but his brochure deserves the attention of those who still have an open mind upon the question.

The Venerable Vincent Pallotti, Founder of the Pious Society of Missions. By the Lady HERBERT, with Preface by H. E. Cardinal VAUGHAN. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company. 1894.

WE are indebted to Lady Herbert for another edifying biography : it is a distinct addition to the comparatively small number of such lives that are accessible to English readers. And it has some special claims on their attention. In the first place the subject of it, Vincent Pallotti, belongs to our own century. He died in 1850 ; he was acquainted with many of our own countrymen, visitors or residents in Rome, who have only died of recent years ; a few may remain of those who knew him. Yet, one of our own day as he was, his life is one of a faith and piety quite primitive and marvellous. He was an apostle of Rome, not unlike St. Philip Neri in many details ; a man of good birth, fair talent, singular humility, and of a zeal as uncompromising as it was joyous and affectionate. His methods of direction, supernatural instincts, and knowledge of hearts again recall St. Philip. To all this is to be added that in his zeal for souls he thought of England and longed to see a college founded in England devoted to the education of priests to be sent on foreign missions, to labour for the conversion of infidel nations. We learn from a letter quoted by the Cardinal Archbishop in his Preface that Father Pallotti communicated this desire to Dr. Wiseman on the eve of the latter's consecration in Rome. Later on, when the present Cardinal, then a young priest, made known his own earnest desire in the same direction, he found Cardinal Wiseman ready to encourage and bless the idea ; not, as Cardinal Wiseman wrote, "from mere personal kindness or over-eager zeal," but because "it is an old and often meditated idea, suggested, or even pressed upon me by a higher and holier mind than yours or mine." The outcome of this was the College of Mill Hill. And perhaps the wonderful success of Mill Hill and of its children, already in so many distant lands the bearers of the glad tidings to the heathen, is, to some extent, due to the prayers and patronage of the Venerable Vincent Pallotti. Further than this, we are indebted to the same holy man for one of our large London missions. He founded the congregation of priests known as the "Pious Society of Missions" ; and a number of them have long served the Church of Hatton Garden and the populous district around. We learn from this volume that the Fathers have also a large mission at Hastings, where very many conversions have resulted from their labours. Lady Herbert writes with directness and simplicity of style, quite becoming a most unworldly life, and with-

out feeling (and rightly) any call upon her to apologise for the marvels with which the life abounds—supernatural gifts, prophecies, miracles, ecstasies, and the rest. It is the life of an apostolic priest—already declared “Venerable” on 13th January, 1887, by Pope Leo XIII.—and being a life of intense faith, has not only the supernatural side just mentioned, but is full of practical lessons for both priest and layman of wonderful self-sacrificing charity. We hope the volume—it contains not quite one hundred and sixty pages—will find many readers.

Outlines of Dogmatic Theology. By SYLVESTER JOSEPH HUNTER, of the Society of Jesus. Volume II. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1895. Pp. 596.

STUDENTS accustomed to the concise style which usually characterises text-books of theology, and especially of scholastic theology, will no doubt find it a little difficult to accustom themselves to the diffuse style of the “Outlines.” But it must be remembered that Father Hunter is not writing for professional students. He is writing for that constantly increasing number of intelligent Catholic laymen who desire to possess a systematic acquaintance with theology, and have hitherto had to content themselves with treatises like those of Bishop Hay. We have no wish to disparage the works of Bishop Hay. That they met a very real demand is evident from the large number of editions through which they have passed. But, excellent though they may be, they will not compare with the text-books of Fr. Hunter. To Catholic laymen, then, who have sufficient appreciation of their faith to desire a detailed and systematic acquaintance with Catholic doctrine, we recommend the “Outlines of Dogmatic Theology.” But it is not to laymen only that the “Outlines” will be useful. They might be of much assistance to students in our theological seminaries. In some of our seminaries there is, in addition to the ordinary course, what is known as the “short course” of Theology. The “short course” is intended for students who are a little older or a little less bright than the average, and the lectures in this course are delivered in English. To the students that follow the short course the “Outlines” ought to be particularly acceptable, and indeed we think that for them it might very well serve as a text-book. The present volume of the “Outlines,” like its predecessor, contains six treatises. These treatises are—The One God; The Blessed Trinity; The Creation of the Angels; Man created and fallen; The Incarnation; and The Blessed Virgin Mary. That we consider the style of Fr. Hunter somewhat

diffuse we have already indicated. But if his style be diffuse, it is at least clear and plain; and this is no small merit when the subject-matter is so abstruse. Occasionally, indeed, there is a want of lucidity, as when our author writes:

At the present day there is general agreement that certain texts of Scripture cannot be understood in any sense which does not imply that God possesses the *scientia media*, and the doctrine of these texts must be accepted, however great may be the difficulty of explaining the *how* of this knowledge (p. 90).

We presume that Fr. Hunter's meaning is that there is general agreement that God possesses that knowledge of things which Molinists ascribe to the *scientia media*. But it is one thing to admit the knowledge and quite another thing to ascribe the knowledge to the *scientia media*. As Fr. Hunter himself writes: "The Thomists did not see the necessity of assigning these objects to a distinct division (*scientia media*) of the Divine knowledge" (p. 99). But though Fr. Hunter advocates the *scientia media*, he is delightfully uncontroversial. He wastes no time on controversy, and he is scrupulously fair to those that differ from him in opinion. We trust that Fr. Hunter, after he has completed the "Outlines," will write a compendium of it in a single volume, corresponding in size to the volume under review. If the compendium rigidly excludes the comparatively unimportant, rigidly excludes unnecessary words on what is important, dovetails part skilfully into part so that Theology may be seen as what it is, an organic whole, it will be, we believe, the most successful book that has been published in English Catholic literature for many years past.

Loyalty to Church and State. By Monsignor SATOLLI. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1895. Pp. 249.

THESE speeches are very unequal in style. The reason no doubt is that they are translations by various hands. It was Monsignor Satolli's custom to dictate the proposed address in Latin or Italian, and it was then translated into English by his secretary or one of his retinue. But though unequal in style, they are characterised by a consistency and unity of thought. The subject-matter of the addresses covers a large field. The Papacy, the constitution of the Church, the spirit of American institutions, education, religious associations and confraternities, and many other topics are discussed. The following extract, taken from the account prefixed to the "Address at Chicago," shows the enthusiasm with which the

Apostolic Delegate was received at the Catholic Congress in that city :

The Delegate seemed himself as much astounded as the still fervent assembly was charmed. His flashing black eyes shone with extraordinary emotion. He stood beside Archbishop Ireland, enthralled by the wonderful welcome that in its sincerity was matched only by its length and its ardor. The people continued to cheer, volley after volley reaching the great avenue upon which the congress building stood: the throngs in the thoroughfares were stopped by its echoes to ask the cause of so prolonged a demonstration of cordiality and delight (p. 142).

We do not understand the meaning of the words "the still fervent assembly" in the above extract. "Still" cannot be an adjective, because the fervent assembly was sending up cheers in volley after volley. It cannot well be an adverb of time, because the Delegate had only just entered, and the presumption would be, of course, against the cessation of their fervour immediately upon his appearance. The volume contains a preface by Cardinal Gibbons and an excellent portrait of Monsignor Satolli. As the proceeds of the sale are to go to the support of St. Joseph's Seminary and Epiphany Apostolic College for the training of missionaries for the coloured people, we trust that the book may have a wide circulation.

Theologia Naturalis sive Philosophia de Deo in usum scholarum. Auctore BERNARDO BOEDDER, S.J. Friburgi, Brisgoviae, sumptibus Herder, Typographi Editoris Pontificii. 1895. Pp. 371.

FR. BOEDDER is favourably known to English readers through the excellent treatise on "Natural Theology" which he contributed to the Stoneyhurst series of Manuals of Catholic Philosophy. The volume under review is in no sense a translation of "Natural Theology." The style is different, the method is different; it is addressed to a distinct class of readers. In "Natural Theology" Fr. Boedder gave evidence of a large acquaintance with English philosophical thought. The references to English systems are less frequent in "Theologia Naturalis." The reason of this is, of course, obvious. The former treatise was written especially for English readers, the latter treatise was not. Nevertheless in "Theologia Naturalis," far greater attention is given to contemporaneous English thought than is usual in Latin text-books. This confers a very distinct advantage on the treatise. The students in our ecclesiastical colleges invariably make use of Latin text-books when

studying philosophy. The reason of this is, perhaps, not altogether apparent. The practice of Rome in this respect does not seem to the purpose. In Rome students of many nationalities attend the lectures. Where there is no native common language, an artificial one must be introduced; and Latin, as more extensively known by students in Rome, is more suitable than Italian. Possibly, so far as England is concerned, it may be one day considered that the tradition which requires Latin text-books has had nothing higher to support it than the mere fact of an absence of suitable text-books in English. But so long as Latin text-books are in use, surely the text-books supplied ought to take account of the systems prevalent in this country. As a matter of fact they do little or nothing of the kind. The frequent references that we find, then, to English philosophical thought in "Theologia Naturalis" make it valuable as a Latin text-book. We find a similar attention to English thought in Fr. Boedder's "Psychologia Rationalis." But "Theologia Naturalis" has other claims to commendation besides the one mentioned. It is valuable for the immense quantity of well-ordered matter which it contains, for the closeness of its reasoning, the originality of its presentation, and frequently for the freshness of its quotations.

The Bible Doctrine of Man. By JOHN LAIDLAW, M.A., D.D., Professor of Theology, New College, Edinburgh; Author of "The Miracles of Our Lord," &c. New edition, revised and re-arranged. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1895. Pp. 363.

THERE is evidence of much learning in the earlier portion of this work, but, taken as a whole, it contains little that would commend itself to Catholic readers. Much of the volume is taken up with considerations of man's original state, his fall, the consequences of his fall, and the transmission of Adam's fall and its consequences to his descendants. So imperfect is our author's acquaintance with the attitude of Catholic Theology to Pelagianism that he stigmatises the doctrine of the Church on these points as Pelagian. What his own teaching may be is not always apparent; but when he writes

This position Protestants had to maintain against Romish controversialists on the one hand and Socinians on the other. These were not so much two extremes as two diverse modes of Pelagianising. The more subtle is that of the Romanists who seem to exalt the divine image in man by adding to it that peculiar feature which they call supernatural,

it seems to us that Professor Laidlaw is the Pelagian. Surely it was the leading tenet of the Pelagian heresy that Adam's state was one of pure nature unelevated by grace. They were as careful to refrain from "adding to it that peculiar feature which they call supernatural" as Professor Laidlaw himself.

Socialism. By Lord NORTON. London: Rivington, Percival & Co. 1895. Pp. 35.

WE are undecided whether to regard "Socialism" as a book or as a collection of notes which it is intended one day to expand into a book. In any case it is a very sketchy and imperfect performance. The writer gives the various definitions of socialism, argues that though a complete social level is impossible, the existing inequality of conditions may be reduced, describes in fragmentary fashion the socialistic schemes of the last hundred years, explains Christian Socialism, points out what charity can do and the method in which it ought to do it, discusses guilds, trade unions, brotherhoods, monasteries, and vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. In the course of his excursions he has some hits at monasticism and celibacy, and smiles approval on Archbishop Whateley, who "in his grand opening essay in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' condemns the whole spirit of monasticism as contrary to the essential unity of mankind" (p. 24). The best thing in the book is a short quotation from Edmund Burke on p. 5.

An Exposition of the Various Divisions of Infidelity. By the Rev. M. P. HORGAN, St. Patrick's, Sunderland. Vol. I. Price Sixpence. Louth: J. W. Goulding, 20 Mercer Row. 1895. Pp. 106.

THIS is an attempt to present in a brief and popular manner some of the many forms of infidelity. The writer expresses his mind with an unconventional plainness. Thus, after describing the doctrine of Spinoza, he writes:

It is astonishing that one could be found amongst the race of mankind capable of advancing such astounding presumptions; but still more wonderful is it that others could be found who would call him a great philosopher instead of calling him a great fool (p. 24).

And again:

Kant believed he had settled all the question of reason on a firm basis, and his philosophy was to have a reign without end. Then Fichte rose and gave his master's philosophy such a hearty Teutonic blow, that it failed to keep upright, and fell. Reinhold planked himself between the two. Schilling came, and changed, and changed, and changing left the scene. Hegel came, and God only knows the divisions of his disciples, right and left, forward, backward, up, down, until chaos came again, and by right ruled supreme over the brood of deep thinkers of the German philosophical world (p. 28).

Besides being an exposition of heresy, Fr. Horgan's brochure is designed to be a refutation of it.

Homiletical Sermon Sketches on the Sunday Epistles, drawn up by a Committee of Priests, and Edited by the Rev. W. M. CUNNINGHAM. London: St. Anselm's Society, 7 Agar Street, Charing Cross. 1895. Pp. 149.

WE believe that, as a matter of fact, the Epistles supply the subject-matter of sermons far less frequently than should be the case. Perhaps the reason may be that priests, with the many calls of mission life upon them, rarely have time to think out sermons for themselves, and are obliged to seek assistance from published sermons which, for the most part, deal rather with the Gospels than the Epistles. But, whatever the cause may be, the fact is much to be regretted. There are rich mines of dogma and moral in the Epistles which, so far as the purposes of preaching go, have not sufficiently been explored. It is with pleasure, then, that we welcome the little volume which lies before us. It draws a useful lesson from the Epistle for each Sunday of the year. The lesson is generally very practical and, for the preacher, is presented in an unusually attractive form. Published sermons are frequently such that a preacher must take all or leave all. There are no suggestions, no indications; a single thought is strained till snapping point. But the "Homiletical Sermon Sketches" are true to their name. They present an outline, suggest thoughts, and leave the development to the preacher.

Some Side-Lights on the Oxford Movement. By MINIMA PARSPARTIS. London and Leamington: Art & Book Company. 1895.

IT is rare to find an *Apologia* written long after conversion, the instinct of most converts of a literary turn being to give others their reasons for becoming Catholics, and to endeavour to persuade

them to follow their example with the least possible delay. Nevertheless, there is something to be said for those who, like "*Minima Parspartis*," pursue the opposite course. A calm retrospect, after a long interval of steady, quiet, Catholic life, may enable an author to describe the great transition from darkness to light more clearly, more temperately, with a fuller appreciation of cause and effect, and with more usefulness to others, than during the period which immediately follows it.

This "story is intended for women," and it is but fair to bear this in mind when subjecting it to criticism.

Among the chief charms of the book are the modesty and humility of "*Minima Parspartis*"; and it may be owing to a superabundance of these virtues that she has allotted an enormous amount of her space to the letters of others, especially those of Mr. Aubrey de Vere. Be the reason what it may, there they are; and, in no unfriendly spirit to the author, we confess to the opinion that Mr. Aubrey de Vere has written the best portions of her book. Not that we are unappreciative of her own work. Her tone is temperate and charitable, her style is fair, and not altogether without a gentle and natural humour. Perhaps, if we had not been warned in her preface that she was writing for women only, we might have considered her a little emotional; but, under the circumstances, that may pass. Two criticisms on the book, however, may fairly be offered: the first that the very long quotations from the author's diary, when abroad, throw no "Light" whatever "On the Oxford Movement"; the second that, excellent as are many of the letters from friends which she has inserted, there are not a few which she might have omitted without loss to her readers.

La Domination Française en Belgique : Directoire—Consulat—Empire : 1795–1814. Par L. DE LANZAC DE LABORIE. 2 tomes. Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1895.

THE system of developing history from State papers which the late Von Sybel, in his "*Historische Zeitschrift*," and when Director of the Prussian Archives, advanced in Germany, has an able supporter in M. de Laborie.

While awaiting the fruit of the labours of M. Chuquet and the completion of those of M. Paul Verhoegen—the one military and political, the other by a local specialist—we welcome these researches in French sources on the administration of Belgium by France from the accomplished historian of J. J. Mounier. Bearing the charac-

teristics of an authoritative work, we do not hesitate to recognise it as a study which, for extent of knowledge, nicety of discrimination, and art of presentment, will enhance the reputation that book brought him.

The history of Belgium under the hand of the Directory, with its destructive maladministration, may not, save in the thoroughness of its examination, break quite new ground. But we are not aware of any other work which traces the imposition of French ideas and their measured acceptance under the Consulate with its constructive failures, and under the Empire with experimental statesmanship making for disintegration. These, while diverse in the means employed to bring about the absorption of the Belgians, were at one in their complete failure to achieve, either by assimilation or administration, that moral conquest without which peoples remain strangers. So that the discontent over which the commissioners of the Directory ruled up to 1799 was still active under the prefects of the Empire in 1814.

The admirable idea of such a history is due perhaps to the author of "*L'Europe et la Revolution Française.*" But the lengthened study of the administrative correspondence preserved in the National Archives at Paris, official texts and contemporary narratives it entailed, prove M. de Laborie to have been worthy the confidence M. Albert Sorel placed in him.

It is incontestable, which perhaps M. de Laborie does not seize in its full significance, that whether governed from Madrid or Vienna the Belgians continued a people homogeneous. Yet, incessantly under foreign dominion, their repugnance to coalesce with a country at one with them in religion and language is a problem in history of singular interest. M. de Laborie has brought to its elucidation the temper of a true historian. Without being either profound or exhaustive his faculty for sifting, comparing, weighing evidence is strong; his impartiality sound; and his judgments impress themselves as the outcome of thought and information. In dealing with a mass of subject-matter his constructive skill is notable; in marshalling and concentrating it on certain vital points, in giving due position to details and the place sympathy should be allowed in producing a living picture, he is excellent. We are conscious of antipathies; but he is, on the whole, free from their bias. The pages he devotes to the wretched statescraft of the Directory are mordant but just; those given to the Peasant's War brilliant and chivalrous; those to the Consulate informing and generous; those to the Empire searching and incisive.

M. Flammarion has told us that "French Royalty ever knew

how to use the best means for quickly conciliating the sympathy and affection of provinces recently reunited to the Crown. . . . The principal was its respect for the customs, the habits, the constitution of its new subjects." The art was apparently lost to the Republic and the Empire. The former made Belgium the unhappy hunting-ground for its adventurers,* some of whom could not write; a mine for extracting the sinews of war and rapacity; where its assignats (paper money) fell in value during two years (1794-6) 99 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. The latter, its field for experiments in alien politics: in contempt of the sentiments and usages of those it tried to govern; of its mania for unification at any price; of its conscription; and of its Gallican insinances.

One of the strongest concurrent causes of the French failure to assimilate the Belgians was, M. de Laborie finds, their treatment of the religious question. We incline to go further and see in it the one predominant cause. Though M. le Comte Boulay de la Meurthe's ecclesiastical history of the Directoire, Consulate, et Empire is still in the future, Sciout, Pierre, and the Canons Claessen and Davis form a basis of authority for sounding this difficult problem. Of these M. de Laborie has availed, except, unfortunately, of the last. When Joseph II. determined to impose his religious innovations on the Belgians, treating as he willed their usages, affections, and inclinations; and to force his "philosophic" spirit and liberalism on Brabant, as he had done on Austria and Lombardy, he came to ignominious grief. The lesson had no teaching for Napoleon. The touch of disdain noticeable in M. de Laborie's attitude to those members of the Episcopate who were inclined to see in Buonaparte—there was sufficient genius in the consulate to excuse the idea—a God-sent deliverer, is not quite in keeping with his usual calm, and betrays a judgment influenced by an after-knowledge of Napoleon impossible to his then contemporaries. But his whole treatment of Napoleon's dealings with Belgium is thoughtful and unanswerable. Finely just, too, his handling of Pisani, de Broglie, and Hirn, who so firmly withstood the pretensions of imperial authority in matters ecclesiastical, as also of that *prêtre du dieu Mars*, de Pradt—who did not.

By the Emperor's attempt to enforce that regal curiosity, the Napoleonic Catechism, the subscription of Seminarists to the

* On January 28, 1796, the Central Commissioner of Jemmappes wrote the Minister of Police: "A force de chercher, j'ai enfin trouvé deux espions, qui servent merveilleusement la République; l'un est deserteur d'un régiment français, et l'autre un perruquier français, émigré et voleur. Je les emploie l'un et l'autre. . . ."

Declaration of 1682—this in a country distinctly opposed to Gallicanism, whose clergy and university had always unanimously upheld the pontifical prerogatives; the establishment of an Imperial University (against which the feeling was so great that M. Hirn wrote the Minister of Worship, “*que beaucoup d’écoles secondaires et de pensionnats ont cessé tout enseignement plutôt que de s’y aggreger*”)—the Belgians were wounded in their sacred sensitiveness. “*Les Français qui occupent les diverses places,*” boldly wrote M. Pisani to the Emperor, whose political genius comes out badly in these volumes, “*devraient en général montrer plus de religion, et le Belge, si zélé pour la sienne n’aurait plus de motifs de se scandaliser de leur conduite.*” But when the “*Restaurateur des autels*”—who to use his own words, *n’aima par le soldat dévot*—invaded the States of the Church and made Pius prisoner, his last hold in Belgium was gone, and Le Debâcle only a question of time. Prayers for the Emperor ceased. Not as de Pradt says because the English were before Antwerp and Napoleon’s star was overcast, but, as M. de Laborie points out, because they scrupled to pray for one excommunicated.

The judicious caution of M. de Laborie’s mind is well illustrated by his treatment of the question of M. Hirn’s personal morality, seriously assailed by Savary in the *Mémoires du duc de Rovigo*. In this he is superior to Thiers, who accepted Savary at his own value.

Historical students have long owed much to Messrs. Plon; this last debt is by no means the least. But how came such careful publishers to issue an important history without an index?

D. M. O’C.

The First two Centuries of Florentine History: The Republic and Parties at the Time of Dante. By Professor PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated by LINDE VILLARI. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

HAD Filicaja’s famous sonnet been addressed to Florence, the history in this book would have been its justification. For it was through a dowry of endless pain with a seal of sorrow set upon her that she carried her fatal gift of beauty, mid the blood of her sons, to a brilliancy of achievement paralleled only by that of Athens. By aggression, war, strategy, and treachery, through personal hatreds and the feuds of generations, she became the awakener of poetry, the renewer of painting, the perfecter of sculpture and architecture, the trainer of diplomatists, the cradle of merchant princes, the

Banker of her continent, founding her liberties amid the envy of her nation.

The theme is captivating in the extreme, with its light and shade, its pathos and enthusiasm, its cruelty and its glory. Developing the permanence of the Latin civilisation amid barbarian Goths and Longobards, its growth under feudalism, until from a state of vassalage whether under Bishop, Count, or Emperor, Florence, with the eleventh century, attained its freedom in the Commune under the encouragement of the Popes as Professor Villari admits, though questioning their motive—a creation of the third estate whence modern society has been evolved.

The facts of this development, its vicissitudes, struggles, dangers, and triumphs are detailed by Professor Villari with a knowledge and research which are very acceptable and worthy all praise. The conflicts of Germanic origins and institutions with Roman origins and traditions, entailing an almost endless feud of city and city; the grouping of families into trade monopolists with their consequent jealousies, rivalries, and factions; the unity of all against a common foe; the gradual leadership of the more leisured; the military and political power they created; its transference to the people; their strength in Guilds with the power and riches they secured; the art and luxury which followed, with the decay inevitable in their wake—through all the multiplicity and confusion of this Professor Villari leads us with clear head and firm hand.

And yet satisfactory as an investigation of the nature of the constitution, of the factions, of the Commerce out of which the Florentine Republic took form and was built up, we do not escape the feeling that it is the work rather of a compiler of history than of a historian. In his arrangement of authorities, in his unwearied examination of documents and the lucidity of their exposition he is excellent. But he infuses no vivifying grace into them. The finer insight into movements, the higher comprehension of statesmanship, the power to reveal the hidden springs of action are wanting. His reading of motives is commonplace, his apprehension of their complexities jejune; while his assessment of history as a field of man's development is by no means penetrating. We regret to have been forced to this conclusion, as his accumulation of documentary evidence and his acquaintance with Florentine story are of importance to historical students.

This lack of largeness of appreciation, the bias which constantly makes us hesitate to accept his judgments, is most apparent in his dealings with the Papacy, one of the most potent factors in the creation of the liberties he is studying. In dealing, for example,

with the formation and object of the Tuscan League his statements of fact are correct. But a comparison of his tone with that of the Lutheran Hurter on the same subject differentiates severely the compiler of history and the historian. The impression Professor Villari conveys is that Innocent, one of the wisest and firmest statesmen Italy has produced, the inflexible defender of her highest liberties, was heedless of her welfare if his own grasping ends were gained. To Hurter he is the man who saved the Papacy from becoming a patriarchate of the Court of Hohenstaufen and Christianity from being a child of its caprices.

His special aversion is Clement IV. The action of this Prince in supporting the Angevin power as a foil to Swabian greed, and then when it grew dangerous checking it also, has no motive to Professor Villari's mind than "the Popes' usual anxiety and dread of losing their supremacy in Italy" for which they ever "resolved in calling fresh strangers to their aid and thus drew fresh miseries on the land." Probably no action of the Papacy—a line of statesmanship initiated by Adrian IV. and Alexander III. and steadily pursued by Clement IV., Gregory X., and Nicholas III.—proved more helpful to the liberties of the Republics than their far-seeing policy of restraining both Imperial and Angevin power as it became absorbing. The policy was eminently patriotic and in many cases finely unselfish: not the outcome of a greed the idea of which Professor Villari has borrowed from Machiavelli. Michaud is certainly no papal partisan, yet his "*Histoire des Croisades*" contains this judgment:

Had it not been for the influence of the Popes it is probable Europe would have been subject to the yoke of German Emperors. The policy of the Sovereign Pontiffs was favourable to the freedom of the cities and the independence of the smaller States of Germany. We do not fear to add that the thunders of the Holy See saved, at least for a time, the independence of Italy and perhaps that of France.

How far his feeling against Clement is allowed to influence his judgment comes out in the matter of Conradin's execution by Charles of Anjou. After denouncing the act and its perpetrator, he adds: "Opinions vary as to the Pope's share in the tragedy. It is certain that he beheld it in silence." His authority is Gregorovius, by no means the sound witness some reviews of his lately Englished history would have us think. It is clear from Alzog that energetic appeals were made both by Clement personally and by him through Louis IX. to Charles for mercy to the young Prince; and Raynaldus is most explicit that Ricordanus and John Villanus both "declare he—Charles—was most sternly rebuked by the Pope."

Gregory X.'s efforts to secure peace between those Guelphs and Ghibellines whose enmity was the curse of Florence are sneered at, and suspected of ulterior design, by Professor Villari. The solemn reconciliation he effected, when oaths of peace were sworn in the presence of the Pope, the Emperor of Byzantium and Charles of Anjou, he pronounces a "farce." Yet, another historian, again no Papal partisan, has this judgment of the Pope in his "History of the Italian Republics":

A glorious pontificate was that of Gregory X. Italy was almost entirely pacified by his impartial spirit at a time when the madness of civil feuds seemed to destroy all hope of repose.

The same presence of the animus of a compiler, the same absence of the temper of a historian, reveal themselves in his references to Cardinal Frangipani's endeavour for the same object at the instance of Nicholas III. For Professor Villari, Nicholas, "full of haughtiness and ambition," was the one who "renewed the scandalous practices of nepotism and simony:" "The unproved and improbable accusation of simony" is Döllinger's judgment after examining the question. And this is the Prince who saved Tuscany from French Rule. For, although Florence was then all powerful in that duchy, it was the Pope, not the city, who compelled Charles to give up his vicariate there, and so broke his hold on Italy. The only motive Professor Villari sees in this act is aggrandisement of the Papacy and the rapacity of the Pope. Now shrewdness was certainly a pronounced characteristic of the Florentines of this day. If the Professor's reading of Nicholas's temperament be correct how came they, on his own showing, to appeal to him to effect the pacification of their city and so lay themselves open to another touch of his rapacity?

The ordinary account of Archbishop Ruggieri's starving to death of Ugolino with his sons and nephews is given, and the ordinary omission also occurs. It is not mentioned that for this crime Ruggieri was thrice summoned to Rome, and not obeying, was condemned in *contumaciam*; though the information is to be found in an author no more recondite than Balbo.

The Professor treats us to some new readings of history. It is calmly stated that the Emperor Frederic II. was exhausted by the continual wars thrust upon him by the Papacy; and that Innocent II. "forced him to fly to arms," and into "the incredible excesses of violence," "without which" he "could not maintain his sway over Italy"! And: "St. Dominic at the head of mobs thirsting for heretic blood had ordained the massacre of the Albigenses and ravaged all Provence"!

We regret an earnest student of historical documents should have endangered his reputation as an historian by such limited appraisements of the motives and actions of the Rulers of men. However, we shall approach the further volume Mr. Unwin has in hand without prejudice being, as he is, lovers of history.

D. M. O'C.

Memoir of Mother Mary Rose Columba Adams, O.P. By the Right Rev. W. R. BROWNLOW, D.D., Bishop of Clifton. London: Burns & Oates.

BORN near Woodchester in 1832, and received into the Catholic Church by F. Austin Maltus in 1851, Sophia Adams joined Mother Margaret Hallahan at Clifton, and after much good work at Stone and St. Marychurch, went out to Adelaide, where she died on December 30, 1891. The Bishop of Clifton, who knew her well during many years at St. Marychurch, writes an edifying and touching biography of one who was both a charming woman and a saintly nun. The book will be highly prized by her religious sisters, and especially by that community in North Adelaide which she founded. But all readers will be pleased and instructed by the picture here presented of a well-dowered and beautiful woman despising the world and living in religion with complete simplicity and absolute devotedness to God and to good works. The most novel, and therefore the most interesting, part of the story, is that which relates to Mother Rose's work in Australia. In July 1883, two ladies of Adelaide, with the warm approval of Bishop Reynolds, obtained six of the Stone sisters for the purpose of taking charge of a hospital at Adelaide. They were all volunteers, as their Rule did not permit them to be ordered out of Great Britain, and Mother Rose Columba was their Superior. The project of the hospital was a failure. It turned out that what the Sisters were expected to undertake was a hospital for both sexes, in which, as a matter of fact, there were four times as many men as women. This was against the Stone Rules. However, instead of coming back again, Mother Rose and her Sisters, at the earnest wish of the Bishop and clergy, stayed at Adelaide and gradually found their work as a virtually enclosed community. They opened a high-class school for girls, which soon began to be extremely successful. After many difficulties and hardships they established the work of the Perpetual Adoration. It is evident that Mother Rose came by degrees to think that this was the special purpose for which God had sent them to the Antipodes. Her letters, and those of her companions, give a very graphic and

detailed account of their beginning in Adelaide—their poverty, the peculiarities of the climate, their teaching-work, and their struggles in church-building. It is a very striking circumstance that the clergy were unanimous, from the beginning, in assuring them that they would do far more for the cause of religion by staying in their convent than by going out. “If you want to do any good here,” said a priest, “keep within.” And again, “I know some who have their eyes on this community, and are attracted to it, because you keep yourselves quiet and do not appear in public” (p. 267). Coming to Australia, these were hardly the views for which the Sisters were prepared :

Humanly speaking [wrote the Superior a few months after landing] we are *not* the religious for this place. Less of religious life and more freedom of action is what seems to be required. We have three times offered to visit the sick poor; a list of those to be visited has been promised, but, with one exception, nothing has come of it. My impression is that the Dean thinks our work is within” (p. 249).

A fortnight later she says: “It seems to me that the community wanted here is one for *God alone*—a community for reparation and adoration” (p. 250). Thus did Almighty God manifest His will, and after some five or six years of doubt, struggle, and desolation, they at last received Archbishop Reynolds’s approbation to establish that Perpetual Adoration which they at once proceeded to make the grand object of their existence. Who can doubt of the necessity for such a work in the midst of the feverish and ceaseless activity of a South Australian colony, or of the blessing which it will bring on priests and flock? The devoted Superior, who had a large share of that bodily suffering which purifies the saints, saw the foundation-stone laid of the desired church, but died before it was consecrated. She was a woman of great good sense, of ardent affections (chastened by spiritual discipline), and of great personal influence. Her powers of literary expression were considerable; there are two letters (pp. 196-7) addressed to a priest, giving him some good advice (which he had asked for), which are as good as anything we have seen in a nun’s biography for a long time.

A Memoir of Mother Frances Raphael, O.S.D. (Augusta Theodosia Drane). By the Rev. Father BERTRAND WILBERFORCE, O.P. London: Longmans. 1895.

A BIOGRAPHY of the late Mother Frances Raphael Drane was called for and was expected. F. Bertrand Wilberforce has accomplished the work with much skill and grace. In a certain

sense Mother Frances Raphael was already well known to our Catholic reading public, and even outside of that circle. Her writings, and above all, her poems, could not fail to impress upon the reader a sense of a personality so strong and so ardent as hers. But all her admirers will be grateful for the story of her earlier years—which is almost an autobiography—and for her many letters. It is a life and a career which is full of noble work, literary and religious, but there is nothing that comes out more strikingly than the capacity of a great mind and warm heart for self-restraint and self-discipline in Christ through grace.

Augustine of Canterbury. By EDWARD L. CUTTS, D.D. London: Methuen & Co.

THE omission of the prefix of holiness in the title of this book shows plainly that it emanates from a non-Catholic source. In spite of this it is an interesting volume, and with the exception of a few remarks regarding miracles and Papal authority, it might have been written by a Catholic. It is a pity that the author, contrary to the practice of all English historians, persists in withholding from St. Gregory the Great the title of Pope. He invariably styles the Pontiff—Bishop Gregory. Dr. Cutts might at least have called him St. Augustine's Patriarch, as the Bishop of Rome has always been, and is now Patriarch of the West. Such a frank acknowledgment of lawful authority would, we fear, completely shatter the theory of the "Italian Mission" of Lambeth origin. St. Gregory did not require usurped authority to bestow the Pall upon the first Archbishop of Canterbury, as he only exercised an act of jurisdiction canonically established both in the East and the West. It was the duty of the Patriarch to confirm the election of an archbishop before the prelate could assume metropolitan powers. Such being the case it was but reasonable that some outward indication of this confirmation should exist. This was secured in the Latin Church by the bestowal of the archiepiscopal Pallium, which had been solemnly blessed by the Pope, and had rested upon the tomb of the Apostle St. Peter. This privilege, reserved as it has been for centuries to the Apostolic See, has become over the whole world a symbol of Catholic unity and lawful jurisdiction.

We are sorry to have to call in question Dr. Cutts's chronology. In the chapter which treats of the synod held by St. Augustine with the British bishops on the banks of the Severn he gives A.D. 601 as the date of St. David of Menevia's death, and therefore gives the

reader to understand that the saint was present at that synod. Now the Bollandists assign the year 544 as the date of the decease of the patron of Wales. In this they concur with most historians. Dr. Rees, in his "Essay on the Welsh Saints," states that there is a difference of twenty years with regard to the date in question amongst chronologists, but he says positively that, whichever system is adopted, St. David's death must have taken place before St. Augustine's mission to the Anglo-Saxons. The date given by Dr. Cutts for the decease of St. Dyfrig (Dubritius) is still more strange, viz., 612. Considering that the saintly Bishop of Carleon resigned his see at the Council of Brevi in 522, and that he was then an old man, it is scarcely possible that he survived till 612.

Apart from these few shortcomings, this life of the Apostle of Anglo-Saxon England, and that of his successors down to St. Theodore, is well worth perusal. The extract that follows is a fair specimen of the spirit in which the book is written. Speaking of the ravages of the Yellow Plague in 664 and its results in England, he says :

The affairs of the Church were in confusion; with a double appointment in Northumbria, no bishop at all in Kent, and the East Saxon See vacant; with the Celtic customs still authorised in Mercia, and lingering in Northumbria and Essex, and the South Saxons still unconverted. The kings of Northumbria and Kent seem to have consulted together on the unsatisfactory state of things. We may with probability credit the older and more experienced, as well as most powerful, Oswy with the proposal that they should seek the consent of the other kings and churches to choose a man who would be acceptable to all, and send him to Rome to be consecrated there, and on his return to exercise the authority of an archbishop over all the churches and bring them into harmony. It was an admirable scheme, and, backed by the influence of the Bretwalda, it met with general acceptance. Wigheard, "a good man and fit priest," one of Deusdedit's clergy, apparently not a monk, was chosen, and sent with some companions to Rome. But Rome, half in ruins, and with the Campagna falling out of cultivation and becoming a breeding-place of malaria, was an unhealthy place; and Wigheard, with almost all his companions, died there of pestilence before he could be consecrated, and was buried at the Church of the Apostle St. Peter.

Pope Vitalian chose St. Theodore to replace the deceased archbishop-elect. Dr. Cutts does full justice to the wisdom of the Apostolic See in this appointment and the happy results that followed.

Compendium Sacræ Liturgiæ juxta Ritum Romanum.
 Scripsit Pater Innocentius Wapelhorst, O.S.F. Ed. 5ta. Neo-Eboraci. Benziger Fratres.

Hymns of the Ecclesiastical Year with accompanying Tunes, and Six Benediction Services. London: Art and Book Co. 1895.

THE Compendium Sacræ Liturgiæ of Father Wapelhorst contains much more liturgical information than is usually found in Ceremonials. It is evidently drawn up to meet the needs of a real missionary clergy always on the move, and therefore often out of the reach of libraries. Its excellences are many. It will suffice, however, to draw attention to those of practical usefulness to all priests.

Besides giving in the text the ceremonies to be observed by the celebrant, the sacred ministers, and servers, the author has introduced diagrams which at a glance give the position of each one at a Pontifical Mass. This is most useful, especially to the assistant deacons when at the altar. It was thoughtful of the author to give the rites of the Jewish Paschal Supper, and to show how traces of these ceremonies still exist in every Christian Liturgy. In chapter xiii., article iv., the Apostolic, the Roman, and the Greek liturgies are placed in three parallel columns and compared with each other.

Chapter xiv. contains much valuable information. Its title, *De sensu literali et mystico singularium partium missæ*, tells us what we may there find. The whole chapter would serve admirably as a help to meditation. The priest who so uses it must derive great benefit from the practice, and greatly increase his devotion whilst celebrating at the holy altar.

Father Wapelhorst has devoted the third part of his ceremonial to the Roman Ritual. Most priests will find this portion of the book both instructive and practical. As it is but seldom that we are able in missionary countries to procure commentaries on the Ritual, the clergy of this country are sure to avail themselves of the help now proffered to them. The fact that this Compendium has already reached its fifth edition shows how wide-spread has been its diffusion throughout the United States of America.

The hymns published by the Art and Book Co. are all inserted in an index, which gives the first line of each hymn, the liturgical office from which it is taken, the name of the author or translator, and that of the composer of the music. Every great festival of the ecclesiastical year has its liturgical hymn given in the vernacular. The great founders of religious orders have each a song of praise.

The music for the chanting of the Rosary has been inserted, as also Benediction services. In all country missions the book ought to be found in the hands of the members of the congregation who are gifted by nature with melody of voice. Even in large town churches it deserves to become a popular manual.

John Wyclif. By LEWIS SERGEANT. London and New York : G. Putnam's Sons. 1893.

IT is never agreeable to have to notice a book unfavourably, but Mr. Sergeant's volume can scarcely be treated otherwise. A life of Wyclif could not be written without constant reference to many points at issue between Catholics and Protestants, and it is natural to expect that the latter will always lean to the side of the Rector of Lutterworth. This is a totally different thing from taking it for granted that Wyclif was always acting from saintly motives, and that the prelates and religious orders, opposed to his innovations in doctrine, were ever actuated by selfish and unchristian principles. The historian, to be worthy of the name, must always be just, and to ensure this he must thoroughly study both sides of the question of which he treats. This the author of the "Life of John Wyclif" has not done, as far as we may judge from the perusal of his work.

When a writer sits in judgment upon a dogmatic decision of the Vicar of Christ, we certainly expect him to know the exact meaning of the Papal definition. The interpretation put by Mr. Sergeant upon the pronouncement of the famous Bull of Boniface VIII., *Unam Sanctam*, is unwarrantable. It is exactly what we might expect from a writer who, not being conversant with Theology, Ecclesiastical History, and Canon Law, must be writing in the dark. A fair-minded man would at least have inquired what Catholic writers have said on such an important subject, before venturing to handle historical and dogmatic matters wholly beyond his sphere of knowledge. There was a time when such literary liberties might be taken with impunity, but happily that day has now passed away, and the English reading public look for fairness and justice in those who pose as historians.

Mr. Sergeant has been equally unhappy in his references to the history of the Franciscan Order. The Bull of Pope Nicholas III. *Exiit*, and that of John XXII. *Quorumdam*, have most probably never been read or, perhaps, even seen by him. Most certainly he has utterly misunderstood their purport. It is useless to dwell

further upon the many misleading statements and wild conjectures in his work, as they will have little weight with most readers.

Publications of the Catholic Truth Society. London :
18 West Square, S.E.

THE sixpenny monthly *Catholic Magazine* which this Society has just started, began well in May and promises a successful career. It is bright, interesting and illustrated. The serial story, "Claudius," of which the scene is laid in the earliest years of Christianity and the principal figure is St. Paul, merits the high praise of recalling "Fabiola" and "Callista." A series of sketches of our Catholic Colleges, beginning with Stoneyhurst, should be both valuable and interesting. F. Thurston, S.J., writes on "Witchcraft," and Mr. Costelloe on "Christian Art;" and amongst other contributors are "Katharine Tynan" and Dr. Barry. The Editor is Lady Amabel Kerr.

The new Dean of Canterbury, who has been suffering lately from a new accession of Protestantism, has provoked from Catholic apologists two valuable replies, in which his shallow show of learning is well exposed, and which the Truth Society has done well to reprint. Preaching last Good Friday in Westminster Abbey, Dean Farrar gave expression to the typically Protestant dislike for the Cross; and not content with this, essayed to show that what he described as morbid meditation on the Passion was unprimitive, unscriptural and uncatholic. F. Thurston's reply is at once convincing and amusing. Apt quotations from the Dean's well-known "Life of Christ" furnish him with a valid *argumentum ad hominem*, and exhibit the absurdity of "Farrar reproving sentimentalism;" whilst more permanent value attaches to a sketch of the evidence from S. Scripture and the primitive church for the traditional observance of Good Friday. F. Procter's little pamphlet was occasioned by the Dean's including Savonarola among the leaders or "harbingers" of the Reformation. Coming from the pulpit as befits the rejoinder of a Friar Preacher, it is couched in more rhetorical tone than F. Thurston's, but is none the less serious and well-grounded. The gist of the reply may be summed up in the words of the Calvinist Bayle:—

"It is very strange that Protestants should number among their martyrs a friar who during his lifetime had always celebrated Mass and invoked the Saints, and who at the hour of his death went to Confession and Communion, made an act of faith in the Real Presence, and humbly accepted a plenary indulgence granted him by the Pope" (p. 5).

"The Land of Mist and Mountain" is a series of Irish sketches full of pathos and quiet beauty, from the graceful pen of Mrs. Hinkson (Katharine Tynan). Perhaps they are too sad and too devoid of incident or adventure to be popular in the ordinary sense; otherwise they come very near to a type of story greatly wanted for general diffusion, wherein Catholicism underlies and pervades the whole, without being unduly paraded. The best of the sketches is "A Saint," the least satisfactory, to our mind, "An Exile's Sister."

"The Venerable Edward Oldcorne, S.J.," was martyred for alleged complicity in Gunpowder Plot. His Life, by Father McLeod, S.J. is very readable and edifying, and includes a graphic account of the labours and sufferings of missionary priests in England under Elizabeth. Three valuable Lectures by the Bishop of Clifton on "Reunion of England with Rome," are also being republished. As we write the members and friends of the Society are met in Conference at Bristol; we sincerely hope that their deliberations will result in strengthening and developing the admirable work upon which the Catholic Truth Society is engaged.

Selected Feast-day Hymns, literally translated, in the original metre and rhythm, by J. P. VAL D'EREMAO, D.D. Latin and English. London and Leamington: The Art and Book Co. 1895.

WE cannot conceive what purpose is expected to be served by this translation of the Church's hymns. The genius of the English language, its rhythm, accents and metre, are so diverse from those of Latin, that a literal translation of liturgical verse, hampered by such restrictions as the author adopts, was foredoomed to failure. The difficulties were not diminished by the evident fact that English is a foreign language to the translator, who, undeterred by danger, has yet essayed a task from which Pope, or Dryden, or Caswall might well have shrunk. Dr. Val D'Eremao admits in his preface that "it needed some courage to put forth yet one more" translation of these hymns—some will think that another word than *courage* would best describe what prompts a man to put forth such prosy, halting, unrhymical verse as this:

"Thou all-creating Lord! recall
That of our body, sometime gone,"
In Virgin's womb, most sacred hall,
By birth the form Thou didst put on" (p. 3).

* * * *

"A novel kind of power behold!
 The waters blush, in jars arranged!
 And when to pour out wine 'twas told,
 Its nature water straightway changed" (p. 7).

* * * *

"Alone, 'mong cities where men live,
 Thou greatest, Bethlehem! decreed
 Salvation's Chief from heaven to give
 In human body born indeed" (p. 9).

If an accurate translation of these hymns were wanted it should have been done in prose; no object, literary, devotional, or liturgical being gained by turning sacred poetry into doggerel like this:

"Thou mountest o'er the starry sphere,
 To where does God himself assign
 (And not to mortals dwelling here)
 To Thee, o'er all things, power divine;
 That this creation's orders three,—
 Or things of heaven, or earth they be,
 Or under earth,—all made by Thee,—
 Should humbly bend the subject knee" (p. 27).

"Come, O Creating Breath Divine!
 Visit the intellects of Thine,
 And fill our hearts with heavenly grace,
 Which their existence to Thee trace" (p. 31).

Or again:

"Unto the weak He His flesh truly gave as food,
 Gave to the sad, too, the cup of His holy blood,
 Saying: 'Receive what I give in this chalice good,
 All drink from it in my memory!
 Thus this new sacrifice did He then institute,
 Of which the offering service He did depute
 Unto priests only, who first take, then distribute
 To all the others, as willed He" (p. 49).

As for singing these verses to the old Gregorian tones, as the author fondly hopes, we should pity the choir that tried to fit the Mechlin chant to the following version of the "*Ave maris stella*."

"Hail, Star of this vast sea!
 God's lov'd mother and yet
 Always virgin purely,
 Happy gate to heaven set.

* * * *

Sinners free from chains strong,
 To us, blind, true light bring,
 Drive from us all our wrong,
 Ask for us each good thing.

Prove thyself our mother,
 Make our prayers received be
 By Him who, our Brother,
 Born for us was of thee" (p. 54).

To judge by the way in which he prints it on p. 66, the author is unaware that the "*Alma Redemptoris Mater*" is written in hexameters, and his version in this case is certainly not in the same metre as the original. Altogether one wonders how the *Censor deputatus* could write "*Nihil obstat*" before the publication. It contains, of course, nothing that is contrary to faith or morals; it is ingenious and well-intentioned; but it has practically resulted in making the sacred hymns ridiculous; and from this the *Censor* might surely have saved us.

Devotions in Honour of S. Thomas of Canterbury. Second Edition. W. Knott, 26 Brooke Street, Holborn.

THIS Manual of Devotions, put forth anonymously, with a Preface by a well-known Anglican clergyman, is altogether Catholic in its tone and spirit, consisting as it does mainly of Masses and Offices in honour of St. Thomas, taken from the Sarum Missal and Breviary; the metrical antiphons and responses, and the majority of the hymns having been translated specially for this work; the rest of the compilation comprising various other prayers, litanies, and hymns. Mr. Worth's preface (we speak of the second edition) is valuable, as showing the antiquity of the Catholic doctrine and practice of the invocation of Saints, at least as far back as the fourth century. It might have been added that the Roman Catacombs testify to the direct invocation of the martyrs in the third century. Origen would be another witness of this period; and St. Irenæus and St. Justin in the second century. This brings us close to the inspired writings, which are not wanting in testimony to the same. Altogether we consider this little Manual admirably calculated to do its share in dissipating the mists of ignorance and prejudice which still obscure the minds of so many of our countrymen. It has been inspired throughout by a fervent devotion to the great Archbishop who championed, even unto the shedding of His Blood, the authority of the Holy See, and whose intercession and blessing have been well merited by this loving tribute from one who cannot be far from "the Kingdom of God."

Loreto, the New Nazareth. By WILLIAM GARRATT, M.A.
London and Leamington: The Art and Book Co. 1895.

THE occurrence on December 10 of this year of the sixth centenary of the miraculous translation of the Holy House of Loreto to its present site renders the appearance of a volume on the history and aspect of the sanctuary especially appropriate. The present work, which has already attained a circulation of 55,000 in five different languages, is admirably adapted to be the pilgrim's *vade mecum*, as it contains in a compact form all the information he can require, while the fifty engravings with which it is illustrated add to the interest and intelligibility of the text. The evidence for the authenticity of this most venerable and august relic is clearly stated, as well as the history of some of the subsequent miracles by which it has been confirmed. The Ark of the New Covenant, it invests the hill above Recanati, which it has chosen for its resting-place, with a sanctity of which that of Solomon's Temple was but a type. It is interesting to note that the building now in Italy formed only a portion of the actual habitation of the Holy Family, which, like many Eastern dwellings, consisted [of excavations in the rocks, either natural or artificial, by which access was given to the interior portion built of brickwork. According to the accepted tradition the Holy House of Nazareth was the home of Our Lady's parents, in which she was born, and which she inherited from them. St. Joseph, who came to live in it after his marriage, had his workshop, according to the custom in Nazareth and the East generally, in a street in the town.

Reviews in Brief.

On the Road to Rome: And How Two Brothers Got There. By WILLIAM RICHARDS. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Brothers. 1895.—In a little book of a hundred and seventeen pages of large print, an American gives an account of his own and his brother's conversion. If it does not contain anything very new, or very striking, or very original, its arguments are offered in a plain and straightforward manner. Possibly this particular *apologia* may be precisely the book most likely to convert some particular Protestant; and, if so, it has our best wishes. At worst, it is well-intended.

St. Chantal and the Foundation of the Visitation. By Mgr. BOUGAUD, Bishop of Laval. Translated from the eleventh French edition. By a Visitandine. With a Preface by His Eminence Cardinal GIBBONS. New York, &c. : Benziger Brothers. 1895.—Many will welcome these two well got-up volumes. The Abbé Bougaud's Life of St. Jane Frances of Chantal was the work of his youth, and it was through it that he was introduced to Bishop Dupanloup, whose Vicar-General and intimate friend he afterwards became. The biography is written in a large, dignified and devout style, with due attention to contemporary history. Mgr. Bougaud prepared for his task with the utmost diligence, and made many discoveries of letters and documents which he here prints or uses for the first time. There are few inaccuracies, even if we judge the work by the light of Canon Mackay's labours. The translator has done her part with good success, and has enriched this edition by a translation of Bishop Dupanloup's admirable Essay on the writing of Saints' lives.

La Guerre Sino-Japonaise et ses Conséquences pour l'Europe. Par F. De VILLENOISY. Paris: Henri Charles. Lavauzelle. 1895.—This pamphlet is full of unmitigated ill-will towards our country. When its author says that the late war between Japan and China was one of the most important political events of modern times, we are much of his mind; when he goes on to foretell all sorts of misfortunes to England as its principal consequence, we cannot agree with him quite so readily; especially

since it has occurred to us that there is such a thing as the wish being father to the thought. He desires a triple alliance between Japan, France, and Russia; and he tries to make out that in that "logic of events," of which his fellow-countrymen are so fond of talking, it is certain to follow. If we are not mistaken, this selfsame "logic of events" was to have led the French to Berlin a quarter of a century ago; and, without entering into details, we may observe that there may be more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in the author's diplomacy.

La Femme Studieuse. Par Monseigneur DUPANLOUP. Sixth Edition. Paris: Pierre Téqui. 1895.—The advantages and necessity of serious mental occupation for women at the present day is the theme of this invaluable little volume, which will well repay the study of ladies of all countries. The utility of some form of intellectual discipline as an antidote to the vacuity which results from a life spent in the mere search for amusement, and for the *ennui* which is the fruitful parent of vice, is here urged with an eloquence and force which make the argument no less attractive than convincing. The first conditions insisted on as essential to the success of any attempt at self-improvement are regularity of hours and perseverance in following out the subjects chosen for study. A book, according to the learned author, in order to render it really useful as food for thought, should be read with the pen in the hand, to write down such ideas as it suggests or to copy out particular passages which especially strike the attention. It is interesting to note that he strongly disapproves of the practice of keeping a diary, as tending to destroy simplicity of mind and to foster a habit of posing for posterity or the public. All other duties will, he contends, be better performed by the aid of the habit of mental discipline and the influence of the wife and mother over husband and children rendered far more potent by the strength of character gained by serious application. Indiscriminate reading is, on the other hand, strenuously condemned by the learned bishop, and he comments severely on the laxity of some Catholic ladies in reading such books as those of Renan and others of his school.

The City of the Crimson Walls. By STEPHEN FOREMAN. London: Kegan Paul. 1895. The author's command of poetic imagery and diction enables him to clothe in fitting language the tragical subjects he has chosen. He has, moreover, the gift, rare among poets at the present day, of telling a story so as to command the reader's interest instead of making his verse a mere vehicle for

the expression of his own vague and shifting moods. The first and longest poem, which gives its title to the volume, consists of a series of lurid pictures unfolding a gruesome drama of crime and retribution, with an element of the supernatural to give added effect to its weird impressiveness.

Kerrigan's Quality. By JANE BARLOW. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1894. The fame acquired by Miss Barlow's graphic vignettes of Irish life gives a double interest to her first venture in fiction on a large scale. But while we have here the same felicitous touches of description, the same vivid power of characterisation, which marked out "Irish Idyls" and "Bogland Studies" as the work of a consummate literary artist, we do not think that the present volume will add to the writer's reputation. The link uniting the two sets of personages is somewhat artificially forged, and the interest flags with the appearance on the scene of the genteel characters who become known to the villagers as "Kerrigan's Quality," from the name of their landlord, the returned colonist. Kerrigan himself is a pathetic figure, and the disappointment of his home-coming to an altered world is touchingly realized. Among many beautifully written passages, that descriptive of life in the Australian bush seems to us the most striking from its tragical power of calling up the grim horrors of the situation. The volume is adorned with eight charming illustrations thoroughly characteristic of Irish scenery and manners.

A Gentleman of France. By STANLEY J. WEYMAN. London: Longmans & Co. 1894.—The astonishing power of vivifying the past shown by Mr. Stanley Weyman, Mr. Conan Doyle, Mr. Louis Stevenson, and others of their school, has restored the historical novel to its place in English literature. The perils and chances through which Gaston de Marsac, the hero of the present work, wins his way to fortune and the heart of his lady-love, have their framework in the wars of the League, and the struggle which ended in the triumph of Henri IV. The wild and tumultuous scenes of this period of storm and stress seem to pass before us as we read, and the pages glow with vivid pictures of the historical events intertwined with the fate of the personages of the tale. Among the most forcible of such presentments are the descriptions of the ravages of the plague in rural France, of the courts of the two Henrys of Valois and Bourbon, and of the assassination of the former and accession of his cousin. The latter event forms the closing episode of the tale from its decisive effect on the fortunes of the hero. This

stirring and spirited romance accordingly ends with the triumph of gallantry and honour over all the intrigues of malice and bad faith.

De Ci, de Là. Par General COSSERON DE VILLENOISY. Paris, Téqui. 1895.—These graceful little essays are entitled “*Causeries d'un Père de Famille*,” and were written, as the author says in his preface, from notes on miscellaneous subjects originally jotted down for the instruction and amusement of his children. In their present form they may serve to interest a larger audience, and to convey at the same time in an agreeable form much information that may be new to general readers. The writer's charm of style gives novelty and freshness to such simple themes as deep-sea fishing, the material of clothing, the effect of glass on domestic life, &c., while the knowledge gathered in a very wide and extensive course of reading lends value as well as charm to the familiar treatment. The sights and objects encountered in an imaginary journey down a river furnish two delightful little *causeries*, in which fish culture, river transport, bridge construction, and other kindred topics are touched on with a lightness that is anything but superficial. For children learning French there could not be a more admirable volume both as to style and matter.

Le Secret Fatal. Par LUCIEN THOMIN. Paris, Téqui. 1895.—The forests of Annam and the typhoon-swept China Seas furnish the scenery for M. Thomin's stirring narrative of adventure. The principal personages escape from a sinking ship on an open raft, only to find themselves exposed to still more imminent danger at the hands of the emissaries of Tu-Duc, the Annamite ruler, in whose dominions they are cast ashore. Here they witness the constancy in torments and death of the Christian martyrs, whose fate they are delivered from by the opportune arrival of a French ship-of-war at the mouth of the river. The hero's life is overshadowed by the threatened vengeance of a sect of conspirators whose secret he has surprised, until the death of their agent at the close of the last chapter delivers him from this incubus, just as his marriage to a beautiful Spaniard renders life doubly dear.

Hariulf; Chronique de l'Abbaye de Saint-Riquier. Publiée par F. LOT. Picard et Fils. Paris. 1894. 10 frs.—This is one of the texts published under the auspices of the Société Historique. It was compiled in the eleventh century by Hariulf, a monk of the great Benedictine house in the East of France; and has the same value for French historical studies as Matthew Paris and the other

monastic annalists have for English history. The editorial work has evidently been done with much care and completeness; especially the tracing out the sources whence Hariulf derived his information.

Saint Étienne et Son Sanctuaire à Jerusalem. Par le P. LAGRANGE. Picard et Fils. Paris. 1894. 5 frs.—This very interesting volume describes the excavations made in the garden of the Dominican house of Biblical Studies. These have laid open the remains of the church built by the Empress Eudoxia over the sepulchre of St. Stephen. The profits of the sale of the book are to go towards defraying the cost of the excavations, and to erecting an effective, but simple and pleasing, church on the same site.

East Syrian Daily Offices. Translated by Dean A. J. MACLEAN. Prepared for the Eastern Church Association. London: Rivington, Percival & Co. 8s. 6d.—This volume is an attempt to set before Western readers something of the fixed parts of the Daily Office of the Nestorian Christians and of the Uniates who have been reconciled to the Church. The order and structure of the whole is so different from those of the Western breviary, that it will probably be unintelligible to most students, unless they have mastered Fr. Zimmermann's articles on this subject. Many of the prayers are very beautiful, especially the antiphons and responses, which are more elaborate and longer than ours; they are also of great value, as testifying to the belief of the Syrian Church before the Council of Ephesus: though the translator is right in urging caution in employing this argument, as it is certain that these religious bodies borrowed from each other details that were popular and interesting.

La Journée des Malades. Par L'ABBÉ HENRI PERREYVE. Dixième édition. Paris: Téqui. 1895.—By reaching a tenth edition this little work has conclusively proved its right to put in an appearance amongst the innumerable literary productions of our day. Both in style and matter "La Journée des Malades" is a remarkable book. Its author, an honorary Canon of Orléans and a professor at La Sorbonne, writes with grace, heart and experience. His subject is evidently one which, for being familiar to him, is not the less felt. In visiting the sick-room he brings with him sunshine and sympathy—the light of healing faith and the magnetism of tactful compassion. There are three divisions in this handy manual. In the first, thoughts suitable to the morning are brought before the invalid. The entrance of dawn into the sick chamber, the sound of church bells summoning the strong to Holy Mass, and other inci-

dents are seized upon in a most easy and natural way, and made to convey the most encouraging lessons to the bed-ridden. The same process is followed in the other divisions of the book, and the relations between the invalid and his medical adviser, as well as those between him and his soul's friend—the priest—are treated with conciseness and theological precision. A valuable introduction has been prefixed to L'Abbé Perreyve's book by the eminent oratorian Father Pététot. It contains excellent advice to the sick and to their friends about the time when the priest should be summoned. To our working clergy, to Catholic nurses, religious or lay, and to every sick person we can safely recommend "*La Journée des Malades*" as a publication helpful in the highest degree. G. H.

Vade Mecum for Colleges, Academies, Sodalties. By a FATHER OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Fifth edition. St. Louis, Mo.: Herder. 1894.—The author's object is to offer boys in schools where the *Prima Primaria* exists a sodality manual and a book of private devotions. Even where the Jesuit sodality is not instituted, boys will find the "*Vade Mecum*" extremely useful in its selection of general prayers adapted to their age and environment. Besides the Rules of the Sodality, the book contains a hymnal noted and the Little Office of the Immaculate Conception in Latin and English.

The Beloved Disciple. By the Rev. FATHER RAWES, D.D. Third edition. London: Burns & Oates.—The publishers have been well advised to bring out a new edition of this little book about "the Disciple whom Jesus loved." Wherever the names of our Redeemer and His Holy Mother are known, hearts preserve a tender affection for St. John the Divine. The passages in the Sacred Gospels where his name occurs suggest so many questions to contemplative souls, that any writings which comment on those texts will be eagerly received and scanned. Nearly twenty years have elapsed since Fr. Rawes brought out this volume of his deep and poetic works. To many of those who read it on its first appearing, "*The Beloved Disciple*" will come back with a sense of freshness, and to those who have never dipped into the book, it comes as a new and valuable acquaintance. Sitting at the feet of the author, we are made to examine and study the precious stones, or scripture texts, which adorn the crown of the Virgin Disciple. Luminous expositions of Gospel scenes cause St. John to stand before us and his earthly glory to break upon us. Step by step we are taken by Father Rawes, from the School of the Precursor, where our Saint was prepared for the Apostolic College, through the painful course of

exercises which formed the heart of the Confessor, on to the training of the Doctor of the Church. St. John is presented to us as a Virgin, as a Martyr, the Prophet of the new Creation, as the Saint of the Precious Blood and the Sacred Heart, and as the Child of Mary, who was to fill with regard to that Mother the place of her Divine Son. Every chapter in this book contains mines of suggestive thought and heart-subduing reflection. The tender sermon preached on St. John by Saint Charles Borromeo fittingly closes the volume.

Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie de N. D. des Victoires. Par M. l'Abbé P. FERRAND. Nouvelle édition. Bourges. Tardy-Pigelet. 1895.—Here in a volume of convenient size we have the life of M. des Genettes and a complete manual of the world-wide archconfraternity which he founded. The history of the establishment of the association is given in the very words of the holy parish priest of Notre Dame des Victoires. Several illustrations add to the attractiveness of this pleasantly written book.

Ancient Devotions to the Sacred Heart. By CARTHUSIAN MONKS. London: Burns & Oates.—It is one of the finest glories of the Sons of St. Bruno that they hold a prominent place amongst the forerunners of the Venerable Père Eudes and Blessed Margaret Mary, and that the Heart of Jesus had Its lovers and Its devout clients in the solitude and silence of La Chartreuse. This little book, which comes to us through a French translation, is compiled exclusively from the writings of Carthusian monks who lived, for the most part, before the Institution of the Feast of the Sacred Heart. The passages rendered in excellent English date from as far back as the fourteenth century. They are full of unction and life. Whether they be taken for the subject of spiritual reading or as matter for mental prayer they will be found most helpful. The Elevations to the Sacred Heart are replete with rich thoughts and suggestive reflections based on the soundest theology. Amongst the authors quoted we find the names of Ludolph of Saxony, Dominic of Treves, Denys the Carthusian, Lansperg, and other great mediæval ascetics. Printers and publishers have turned out a handy, readable, and well-bound volume.

Books Received.

- Au Milieu des loups.** Léon Noble. Paris: Téqui. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 370-382.
- La Femme Studieuse.** Mgr. Dupanloup. 6^{ème} édit. Paris: Téqui. 8vo, pp. 316.
- Catholic National Speller.** New York: Benziger Brothers. 8vo, pp. 144.
- Roman Claims. Reply to the Bishop of Manchester.** Rev. B. Vaughan, S.J. Catholic Truth Society. 8vo, pp. 158.
- A Short History of the Catholic Church in England.** Catholic Truth Society. 8vo, pp. 502. 3s. 6d.
- Loreto, the New Nazareth.** W. Garratt, M.A. London: Art and Book Company. Large 8vo, pp. 419. Illustrated.
- De ci, de là. Causeries d'un Père de Famille.** Général Cosseron de Villenoisy. Paris. Téqui: 8vo, pp. 404.
- German Grammar.** Dr. Rudolf Sonnenburg, Rev. Michael Schoelch. Fribourg: Herder. 8vo, pp. 308.
- The Child's Bible History.** Adapted from Dr. Schuster and G. Mey, by Bishop F. J. Knecht. Fribourg: F. Herder. 8vo, pp. 104. Illustrated.
- Fabiola.** Cardinal Wiseman. New edition. London: Burns & Oates.
- Le Journée des Malades.** L'Abbé H. Perreyve. 10^{ème} édit. Paris: H. Téqui. 8vo, pp. 306.
- Outlines of Dogmatic Theology.** Vol. II. Rev. Sylvester Hunter, S.J. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 8vo, pp. 596.
- La Vie pour les autres.** L'Abbé Pierre Vignot. 2^{ème} édit. Paris: Poussielgue. 8vo, pp. 384.
- Les Églises de Jerusalem.** R. P. Dom, F. Cabrol. Paris: H. Oudin. 8vo, pp. 198.

- Homiletical Sermon Sketches on the Sunday Epistles.** Rev. W. Cunningham. London: St. Anselm's Society. 8vo, pp. 149.
- An Exposition of the Various Divisions of Infidelity.** Rev. M. P. Horgan. Louth: J. W. Goulding. 8vo, pp. 106.
- L'Enfant.** Mgr. Dupanloup. 6^{ème} édit. Paris: Téqui. 8vo, pp. 514.
- The Origin and Nature of Man.** S. B. McKinney. London: Elliot Stock. 8vo, pp. 96.
- Maynooth College: its Centenary Record. 1795-1895.** By the Most Rev. John Healy, D.D., LL.D., M.R.I.A., Bishop of Macra and coadjutor Bishop of Clonfert, Senator of the Royal University of Ireland. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. 4to, pp. 770. Illustrated.
- The City of the Crimson Walls.** Stephen Foreman. London: Kegan Paul. 8vo, pp. 152.
- Nature versus Natural Selection.** Charles Clement Coe. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 8vo, pp. 591.
- À Vingt Ans. La question du bonheur.** Mme. E. D'Aguillon. Paris: Téqui. 8vo, pp. 385.
- Richard Rolle of Hampole.** (Library of Early English Writers.) C. Horstman. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 8vo, pp. 442.
- La Route de la Sibérie.** Lucien Thomas. Paris: Téqui. 8vo, pp. 304.
- Le Secret Fatal ou le Pacte des Régicides.** Lucien Thomas. 2^{ème} édit. Paris: Téqui. 8vo, pp. 272.
- La Guerre Sino-Japonnaise.** F. de Villenoisy. Paris: Henri Charles-Lavauzelle. Pp. 48.
- A Forgotten Chapter of the Second Spring.** Very Rev. Dr. Casartelli, M.A. London: Burns & Oates. 8vo, pp. 44.
- Robinet de Plas.** L'Abbé Profflet. Paris: Téqui. 8vo, pp. 297.
- Replies of the Archbishop of Melbourne to the Anglican Bishop of Ballarat and Canon Potter.** Melbourne: Thomas Vergu. 8vo, pp. 114.

- On the Road to Rome and how Two Brothers got there.** William Richards. New York: Benziger Brothers. 8vo, pp. 117.
- Hairulf. Chronique de l'Abbaye de Saint Requier** (v. siècle—1104). Ferdinand Lot. Paris: Alphonse Ricard et fils. 8vo, pp. 360.
- Fontes Juris Ecclesiastici Novissimi.** Rev. P. Schneider. Ratisbon: F. Pustet. 8vo, pp. 136.
- Vedic India.** Zénaide A. Ragozin. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 8vo, pp. 457.
- Le Maréchal de Ségur (1724—1801).** Le Comte de Ségur. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 8vo, pp. 398.
- Lexicon Syriacum.** Carolus Brockelmann. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 4to, pp. 570.
- The International Critical Commentary. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy.** Rev. Dr. S. R. Driver. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 8vo, pp. xcv.—434. 12s.
- Grammaire Hébraïque Élémentaire.** Mgr. Alphonse Chabot. 4^{ème} édit. Fribourg: Herder. 8vo, pp. 170.
- Theologia Naturalis sive Philosophia de Deo.** Rev. B. Boedder, S.J. Fribourg: Herder. 8vo, pp. 358.
- Rituale Romanum Pauli V. P.M. iussu editum et a Benedicto XIV. actum et castigatum.** Ratisbonæ: Fred. Pustet. 8vo, pp. 404—284.
- Questions Actuelles d'Écriture Sainte.** R. P. Brucker, S.J. Paris: Victor Retaux. 8vo, pp. 330.
- Stenopy, or Shorthand for the Typewriters.** Rev. D. Quin. Providence. R.I. Continental Printing Company. 8vo, pp. 56.
- Memoir of Mother Frances Raphael (Augusta Theodora Drane).** Rev. Fr. Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. 340.
- Some Side Lights on the Oxford Movement.** Minima Parspartis. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company. 8vo, pp. 468.

- Loyalty to Church and State.** Most Rev. Archbishop Satolli.
Baltimore: John Murphy. 8vo, pp. 248.
- The Ethics of the Old Testament.** Rev. W. S. Bruce, M.A.
Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 8vo, pp. 292.
- An Isle in the Water.** Katharine Tynan. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Nebular Theory.** William Ford Stanley. London: Kegan Paul & Co. Pp. 259.
- Church History.** Rev. R. Parsons. New York: F. R. Pustet & Co. Pp. 581.
- Thousand and One Day Entertainments from Araby.** London: Burns & Oates. Pp. 357.
- The New Life in Christ.** J. Agar Beet, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. 347.
- Catholic Socialism.** Francesco Nitti. London: Swan Sonnenschein. Pp. 432.
- La Table Eucharistique.** P. Servais. Paris: Téqui. Pp. 108.
- B. Bonifacio Di Savoia.** Arcivesco di Cantorbery. Torino: Stanperia Reale Della Nitta. Pp. 88.
- The Pure Love of God.** Very Rev. J. A. Maltus, O.P. London: Burns & Oates. Pp. 40.
- The True Church of the Bible.** Rev. W. Flemming, M.R. London: R. Washbourne. Pp. 109.
- The Watches of the Passion.** Fr. P. Galwey, S.J. London: Art and Book Company. 2 vol., pp. 734-794.
- Agnosticism and Religion.** Rev. George J. Lucas. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. Pp. 136.
- Cenni Sul Rito Ambrosiano.** Dr. Marco Magistretti. Milano: Tipografia Editrice L. F. Cogliati. Pp. 67.
- Life of the Rev. Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia Pelletier.** A. M. Clerke. London: Burns & Oates. Pp. 410.
- Tableaux Synoptiques de Littérature Française.** L'Abbé J. Seytre. Avignon: Aubanel Frères. Pp. 87.

- Les Assemblées Provinciales.** Ernest Carette. Paris: Alphonse Picard. Pp. 503.
- Physica.** Petri Cardinalis Pázmány. Budapestini: Typis Regis Scientiarum Universitatis. Pp. 614.
- L'Europe Le Saint Siège.** A. Lapôtre. Paris: Alphonse Picard. Pp. 367.
- La Vie de N. S. Jésus Christ.** L'Auteur des Avis Spirituels. Paris: P. Téqui. 2 vols. Pp. 647-612.
- Saint Albert.** La Comtesse de Louvagny. Paris: Téqui. Pp. 317.
- Vie Mortelle du Christ.** L'Abbé Bouchet. Paris: P. Téqui. Pp. 500.
-







Does Not Circulate

AP 4 .D8 SMC

The Dublin review.

7.

AIP-2395 (awab)



